

THE FORTNIGHTLY

FEBRUARY, 1947

WHY MEN STRIKE

BY PETER F. DRUCKER

THE most urgent need of domestic policy to-day, in all industrial countries, is to work at the causes of labour conflict, their diagnosis and control.

We cannot even escape any longer into the complacent belief of an earlier generation that a radical change in the legal structure of the economy such as the "elimination of the capitalist" will abolish or even significantly mitigate labour conflict. It is no accident that we no longer talk of the conflict between capital and labour but of that between management and labour. For we know—from first-hand reports of Western engineers working in Russia under lend-lease, as well as from official Russian publications themselves—that the industrial manager in the Soviet Union, although he does not have to worry about union trouble, faces pretty much the same labour relations problem as his colleagues in capitalist countries. And the first and biggest problem which has been confronting European socialism in nationalizing industries, in Britain as well as in France and Czechoslovakia, has been the conflict between the government as manager and the workers. This conflict is obviously rooted in conditions, relations, and policies general to modern industry and technology rather than specific to this or that "system". What we need is not an ideology but a science—a new science of industrial peace.

The new science—or art—of industrial peace (like politics, it is both) is still in its infancy. Our ignorance still covers a much larger area than our knowledge. Also, we have concentrated our attention on manufacturing industries and have rather neglected industrial relations in the numerically more important distributing and service trades. But—largely unnoticed by the general public, lawmakers, managers, and union leaders alike—we have amassed during the past quarter century a very considerable amount of knowledge and experience about the nature of human relations in industry; and we have acquired at least an elementary understanding of the proper policies to make the worker not only contented but eventually an active partner and citizen in the industrial community.

The first conclusion is that *the causes of labour conflict and unrest are almost always to be found in concrete policies and in objective conditions*, not in somebody's villainy. The second is that *wage rates are rarely an important cause of labour trouble in industry*. And the third general conclusion is that *there is no one cause of labour conflict*.

But there are a few important causes one or more of which—though in

greatly varying proportions and in constantly shifting weight—can usually be found at the bottom of industrial conflict and labour unrest. These main sources of trouble, listed in purely arbitrary order, are:

- (1) Managerial unfairness (or the appearance of managerial unfairness) in the handling of contractual relations: especially in the treatment of grievances, in the establishment of wage differentials between different jobs, in making plan rules and in changing them, and in promoting and firing workers.
- (2) The physiological and psychological effects of certain types of assembly line work.
- (3) The tendency throughout industry to organize work and pay scales in such a way as to set the individual worker against his fellow workers or to isolate him from them.
- (4) The economic insecurity of the worker.

While these causes are by no means always predominant or even always present where there is labour trouble, they are so general and are responsible for so much of the conflict, bitterness, and resentment that any industry that should succeed in eliminating them, or at least succeed in reaching the point where management and labour can work together on their elimination, would have built a firm basis for normally good industrial relations. And every one of these causes can be tackled successfully, at least in part.

Of these four prevailing causes of labour conflict, the most general one and the one about which the workers themselves are the most vocal, is the resentment against unfairness (real or fancied) on the part of management in the day-to-day handling of its contractual relations with the worker: working rules and their changes, firing and lay-offs, promotions, the establishment of wage differentials, and the settlement of grievances. These matters take up the bulk of practically every union contract. With respect to every single one of these points the unions have gained almost all their specific demands. Occasionally, as in the establishment of the unqualified seniority basis for promotions, they have gained more than is compatible with the best national interest. Yet on the whole, the resentment against managerial unfairness in handling these matters is to-day as great as it has ever been.

The fault is very largely management's—and it is a fault of elementary political intelligence. Management, especially the subordinate local managers of plants and divisions, have chosen this area as the basis for guerrilla warfare against the unions. They tend to turn every single question of agreement interpretation into a test of strength. Actually nothing is less likely to weaken the union or to strengthen management's authority than this policy of pin-pricks, for every single such case is of direct and vital importance to an individual worker. Management's prevailing attitude can only confirm the employee in his belief that the union alone protects him from managerial unfairness and tyranny; and it also puts a premium on union pugnacity and irresponsibility.

The solution is to take the whole problem out of the area of conflict. This can be done only by admitting the workers to full and equal partnership and

responsibility in all decisions that come up under the union agreement or under the rules of the plant.

The joint management-worker committees in many of the plants meet regularly whether there is something to decide or not. This makes it possible to iron out many difficulties before they ever become grievances, and to discuss changes in working rules well in advance of a decision. It also makes the normal contact between management and workers' representatives a friendly one—in sharp contrast to that in most companies, where management and workers' representatives never meet except to fight something out.

Another important point is that grievances must be settled immediately. If not disposed of within five days they go automatically to appeal; and the five-day rule applies to the appeals boards as well. This provision forces managements to take grievances as seriously as the worker does.

In every case the key to a successful solution is recognition on the part of management that these decisions are of such overwhelming importance to the individual worker, and to the workers as a whole, that they can be taken only with the joint participation and responsibility of the workers' representatives.

If the worker's resentment of managerial unfairness in the handling of agreement matters is his most vocal grievance, his deep resentment against the prevailing type of assembly-line work is as a rule hidden even from himself.

In traditional mass production there are three things that cause severe disturbances. First, the worker is confined to one motion: a fact which results in fatigue, in physiological and neurological damage (tics, headaches, deafness, neuritis), and finally in a numb resentment. Secondly, the worker is chained to the speed and rhythm of the slowest man on the line and is not allowed to work at his own speed and rhythm; the result is again fatigue and irritability, nervousness, and jerkiness. Finally, the worker never does a whole job, never makes anything that he can identify as his own personal product; this leads to lack of interest and to a deep sense of frustration.

These dissatisfactions are not inevitable results of following the principles of mass production. They result, not from its basic concepts, but from the unthinking use of the human being as if he were a machine tool designed for one purpose only. But, needless to say, this is a gross abuse, or misuse, of that wonderful, multi-purpose tool, the human being; and like all abuse of tools, it results in low productive efficiency and in shoddy work. The traditional assembly line is simply a piece of poor engineering judged by the standards of human relations and output.

During the war we learned—by necessity, not by design—not only that the orthodox assembly line is not indispensable, but that it is very often a highly inefficient way to apply mass production principles. We were forced to mass-produce a great many products, such as bombsights, which for technical reasons could not be handled on the orthodox assembly line. In other cases, the available labour supply made it impossible to use the orthodox methods. Thus

engineers were forced to think about the fundamentals of mass production, rather than to copy traditional methods blindly; and the results of this first critical analysis were amazing.

Mass production rests on three principles: the breaking up of a complex, skilled operation into its component elementary and unskilled motions; the synchronization of the flow of materials with human operation; and the interchangeability of parts. Of these only the first matters here. In the traditional assembly line each of the elementary motions is performed by a separate worker; the intellectual process of analysis is laid out *in space* with each separate analytical step represented by a separate worker. This would have been the right—in fact, the only right—method if the work were done by single-purpose machine tools, such as a reamer or a trip hammer. But it makes no sense if we use people to do the work.

The right method, as we found in literally hundreds of instances during the war, is to lay out the assembly in *concept* rather than in space. This means that we still go through the breakdown of the operation into elementary motions. But instead of having each motion performed separately by one worker, a whole sequence of motions is performed one after the other by one worker.

At Cadillac in Detroit, for instance, completely unskilled and industrially inexperienced Negro women made a high precision aluminium part for aircraft engines; each one turning out a finished product. Every girl worked by a chart which showed in three parallel columns what to do next; what to look for before doing it; speed, temperature, etc.; and what the step accomplished. The worker still did nothing but unskilled motions which were easy to learn; in fact, it took no longer to train these women than it would have taken to train them for orthodox assembly line work. But every girl did a whole operation which brought into play one muscle after the other, thus giving the whole body a chance to rest and a chance to develop a working rhythm. Also each girl could work at her own speed and could vary the speed, in itself one of the best means of combating fatigue. And each worker produced an entire product with all the satisfaction that goes with it. As a result, there was not only a highly satisfied and happy labouring force; there was also an extremely efficient one which produced more than could have been produced on the orthodox assembly line.

It is not likely that the lessons learned during the war will soon be applied wholesale to peacetime production. In the first place managers, very understandably, went straight back during reconversion to the old methods which they knew and understood, instead of experimenting with new ideas. Also, there are certainly some operations—the final automobile assembly line would be one—where the new methods could be applied only with great difficulty, if at all. The main obstacle to the large-scale application of the new method is, however, that we still lack a sufficient theoretical understanding of its

principles.

If the traditional assembly line method creates emotional and physiological disturbances because it violates the simple truth that man is a being rather than a machine tool, the even more general tendency to organize the worker's work in such a way as to put him apart from, or in opposition to, his fellow workers violates the equally basic truth that man is a political being. No one finding in the whole field of industrial relations is as well-documented as the one that men spontaneously, and by their nature, work in groups and that any policy or organization that disturbs or tears apart the team is bound to cause severe trouble. Yet of all the major causes of labour trouble, this is the one that managements pay the least attention to—probably because the workers themselves are so rarely vocal about it.

In the autumn of 1943 I visited two tank engine plants in two neighbouring Mid-western cities (let us call them Indianapolis and Dayton, though these are not the real names). Both plants were run by the same company and they produced identical goods, prepared and laid out by the same engineering department. Yet they differed markedly in their performance. The Dayton plant—an old ramshackle building hastily converted to war use—did a superb job, regularly exceeded its production quota, had a very low labour turnover in an area with a rapidly shifting working population, and had a low absenteeism rate, a low accident rate, and generally satisfactory labour relations. The Indianapolis plant—brand new and specially built for this war job—worked rather poorly with a productivity one-sixth less than Dayton, plenty of labour turnover, too many accidents, and pretty badly strained labour relations. What baffled the engineers most was that every single manipulation was done faster in Indianapolis—yet the end result was less output.

There was but one difference between the two plants. In the new plant in Indianapolis all details of the worker's job had been worked out in advance by an ultra-progressive management; all he had to do was to follow instructions. In Dayton there had been no time to do that. Management had done the over-all engineering and had worked out the general layout of each operation; but it had had to leave the actual details to be worked out by each group of men among themselves and with their foremen. Management—by necessity, not by choice—did not interfere as long as the production quota set by its engineers was reached and surpassed. The superintendent who showed me around in Dayton apologized all the time for what he called the lack of neatness; for no two aisles did the job in quite the same way or at quite the same speed. In one group the same man would always hold the cylinder block while the cylinder heads were put on by four others; in the next group the men would rotate, etc. In Indianapolis, on the other hand, everybody did the same job in the same way at the same speed.

But Dayton was a "happy plant"; Indianapolis was miserable. In Dayton every single group of men insisted on showing our party how they did the

job. There was a friendly rivalry between the aisles, the atmosphere was unhurried and easy-going, and the men talked to one another while they worked. In Indianapolis everybody was far too busy to look up from his work when we passed by. They hardly talked to one another for fear of falling behind.

It took the bosses some time to find out that it was precisely the "lack of neatness"—supposedly so deplorable—that was responsible for the good showing of the Dayton plant. And it took even longer to introduce the Dayton methods in Indianapolis; both the local managers and the workers resisted it at first. But a year later when I returned both plants were working on a system under which every aisle was working as a team; and both plants were equally efficient and enjoyed equally good labour relations.

Everybody realizes to-day that a sense of economic insecurity is a major source of unhappiness and opposition among workers. Indeed, we are in danger of over-emphasizing this feature in the labour picture to the neglect of other equally important ones.

But the real problem lies much deeper than is generally realized and has to do with fundamentals rather than with techniques. People often ask why the worker should enjoy any more economic security than the doctor, the lawyer, the farmer, or the cigar-store owner. This question so completely misses the point as to illuminate it.

In the first place, there is the basic difference that the worker by his own efforts cannot do anything at all to counteract the effect of economic fluctuations on his own economic position. No amount of ingenuity or inventiveness, no amount of skill can help him if he has no job; for without access to tools—that is, to the machines in the plant—the worker cannot produce anything at all and is condemned to social ineffectiveness. In the second place, the whole tendency of industrial thought and action—and in this respect there is not the slightest difference between capitalism and socialism—has been to conserve machinery and materials rather than to conserve the workers. Machinery is regarded as "capital equipment" which must be maintained in at least reasonably good condition even when it is not in use, and must be serviced on a long-term basis. Labour, on the other hand, is treated as if it were a raw material—to be bought or not bought, as business conditions may warrant.

It is likely that the annual wage will become labour's most serious demand in the next few years in America. For the annual wage forces the employer to look upon labour as a "capital asset" rather than as a raw material. And for this reason it is imperative that the annual-wage idea shall not be killed in its infancy by mismanagement or by demagogic stupidity. The annual wage cannot possibly be a guarantee of full employment; it can only guarantee a minimum income.

It is even more to the interest of the worker than to that of the employer that this minimum be kept so low that there is no danger that the plan will

collapse when the worker will need the protection most, that is, in slack times.

The greatest danger to a successful realization of the idea is, however, that the annual wage may be mistakenly looked upon as a protection against depression unemployment. If the worker really wants the annual wage—and there is no doubt that he both wants and needs it—he will have to insist on a clause providing that the plan shall be suspended if orders over a period of months fall below the levels of a “normally bad” year. Otherwise the economic landscape will be cluttered with the wrecks of annual wage plans in the first major setback, and the whole idea will be discredited for a long time to come.

Yet without some definite guarantee against depression unemployment we cannot hope to eliminate the worker's basic feeling of economic insecurity and the effects of this feeling on his attitude towards society in general and his employer in particular. Even in England to-day, where all signs point to a long-time shortage of workers rather than to a shortage of jobs, the memory of the depression haunts the worker and determines very largely his actions and thoughts. That only a positive employment-creating policy can give the necessary protection against the depression threat to the worker's security has become a commonplace even though it was clearly formulated for the first time only a few years ago in the Beveridge plan.

But with this statement the student of industrial relations parts company with Beveridge and with all the full employment economists whether of the right, the left, or the middle. Not that he quarrels with their economics; it is their ideas about their human relations that are all wrong and contrary to everything we have learned. The economists are all out to guarantee jobs; but what the worker needs is not a guarantee of sixty million jobs but of one particular job, his own, and the jobs of his fellow workers in the plant, and of his fellow townsmen. Where the economists deal with the over-all economy, twenty-five years of industrial relations work have taught us conclusively that we must always tackle every single industrial relations job in the individual plant. What is needed for industrial peace is not one big full employment plan, but many little ones.

We should be able to make some headway with these many little plans even on the strictest Keynesian principles. The core of all full employment plans is the proposal to distribute capital goods investment evenly over the business cycle. But there is no good reason why this should be done by the government rather than by individual corporations.

The first step in such a policy would be to put corporation payments on a cyclical basis, something not much more difficult than the shift to the “pay-as-you-earn” system of individual income tax payments. Each company would make an annual tax return as it does now, but it would pay taxes only on its estimated average cyclical profit. All profit over and above this figure should be exempt from taxation, *provided it be put into a long-term capital invest-*

ment fund. Whatever sums in this fund are not used for employment-creating capital investments after ten or fifteen years would automatically become subject to tax; and if they should remain unused, even though there should be a depression and unemployment, the tax should be confiscatory. But the tax would be permanently waived if the fund actually were used in depression years for employment-creating investments.

A few years of moderately good business would provide us with a fund more than adequate to maintain the necessary investment in capital goods even in the worst depression years. Assuming total corporate profits (before taxes) of twelve billions* a year—a very low estimate—we could expect annual reserves (over and above depletion) and average profit to come to about three billions. In five years of moderate business we would thus have an employment fund of fifteen billions, which is more than the total amount that, if spent on capital investments in 1932, would have converted a period of intense suffering and unemployment into one of high business volume and full employment. Actually it can be shown that the fund would be sufficient to maintain employment at the level of the minimum guaranteed in the annual wage if only the present corporation taxes—rather than the profits taxes—were put into that reserve.

To gain the proper effect on labour relations these employment-creating funds must be tied up directly with the worker's job. Hence it should be made compulsory for all businesses accumulating such tax-exempt funds to work out, during the good years, specific employment-creating capital projects for the bad years to come—such things as modernizing their equipment, improving their plants, expanding their scope, working on new products, etc. These projects should be as definite as possible and should contain some forecast of labour-hours needed, of the type of work involved, etc. And it would be only the most elementary common sense to bring the workers' representatives into the preparation of these projects. For while it is neither necessary nor possible to give the individual worker a binding promise of minimum employment, the plant community as a whole should know in detail what it can expect when orders fall off.

This is but a vague outline of an approach rather than a finished plan; and many very important problems obviously would still have to be worked out. It is offered here only to show that even the most dreaded economic insecurity, the insecurity of a depression, can be tackled in a way that promises greatly to relieve industrial tension—a way, incidentally, which like all the other policies discussed here, would be as beneficial to management as it would be to the workers.

*A U.S. billion equals one thousand millions.

SOCIALISM AND THE COLONIES

BY ARTHUR CALDER-MARSHALL

THE Socialist Government inherits from its predecessors a complex colonial policy, which is the result rather of past and present pressures than of any carefully thought out philosophy.

During the earliest phase of commercial and strategic expansion, the main emphasis was laid upon internal security, the preservation of law and order with the smallest occupational force. This led to the system of Native Administration, the establishment of friendly (or to use a later terminology, quisling), chieftains and emirs, ruling on traditional lines, but with advice from colonial officials. It produced an artificial crystallization of the social patterns of colonial peoples as at the time of conquest. The abolition of tribal wars, which had been the natural consequence of expanding tribal populations and declining land fertility, created problems which sooner or later had to be tackled by services wider than those offered by a police force.

The second phase arose out of the limitations of the first. The agitation of the local population and the recommendations of government officials led to the gradual extension of services to include general education and specialist instruction and aid in matters of hygiene, medical facilities, farming and so on. At the same time, the commercial undertakings pressed for better roads and railways, improved port facilities and limited education to provide a source of skilled and semi-skilled local labour.

This development snowballed. It contained within itself the third phase, the recognition that the exploitation of a colony by outside capitalist undertakings could not proceed unchecked. The corollary to the voting of British taxpayers' money to the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund was the imposition of Colonial Income and Company Tax during the war.

With the money thus acquired, added to further sums to be raised by local subscription, we are now entering on the fourth phase, which broadly consists in the planning of colonial development along the old lines, but at a quicker tempo.

Since the Socialist Government has been in power, there has only been one full dress debate on Colonial Affairs. It lasted for six and a half hours and was very poorly attended by both sides of the House. It was an undistinguished debate, but it enabled George Hall, then Colonial Secretary, to make a declaration of Socialist colonial policy. Following him Oliver Stanley, Tory ex-Colonial Secretary remarked:—

The Right Hon. Gentleman started his speech by telling us that since the electoral events of July, it was necessary for him to make a declaration of policy for the Party now in power. I listened to it with great interest, and I must confess with a certain amount of familiarity. It did not seem to differ greatly in essentials from the policies which have been declared on previous occasions.

That was no mere debating point. It is, to my mind regrettably, only too true. There is no substantial difference between Tory and Socialist Party policy towards the colonies.

There is however a very considerable difference between the Tory and the Socialist views at the present time towards India, Burma and Egypt. The Socialists realize that our position there has become untenable. The only constructive thing which the British can do is to get out.

This is the acknowledgment of the failure of our mission, not of its accomplishment. In all those countries, it is certain that a period of social upheaval lies ahead; because British rule did not solve the social conflicts in India or Burma, but merely obfuscated them; just as the presence of British troops on the Citadel in Cairo provided Egyptian capitalists with the distraction which they wanted from the main economic conflicts within the country.

To the colonial peoples, we have also promised political independence at some future date. The example of India is encouraging the demand to make that 'future date' as soon as possible. And with the steady growth of the colonial intelligentsia, pressure is going to increase in volume and intensity.

So the question arises now: "What sort of a West Africa or West Indies do we want to see independent?" Do we want to be forced as we have been elsewhere to admit that we have failed in our task and we can no longer hold the colonial peoples down? Do we want to resign ourselves, for example, to seeing the Southern Nigerians fight out the mastery of Nigeria with the Hausa people of the North? Or do we want to hand over to people who have already learnt the discipline of democracy and whose racial and economic conflicts have already been resolved by socialism?

I believe that it is of paramount importance both for our own country and for the colonies that we should set about creating socialist communities in the colonies so that when the hand-over takes place internal strife is avoided; and if possible, the colonies themselves should opt to become self-governing dominions in a British Socialist Commonwealth. But if that is to be done, we must have a clear break in colonial policy.

Though the historic differences between the present situation of the Socialist party and those of the Bolshevik party, after the revolution, are very considerable, a brief examination of the liquidation of Russian imperialism is instructive. The Bolsheviks did not say, and I think quite rightly, that they were concerned with a socialist revolution only in Russia. They were in favour, neither of allowing the Russian Empire to break up into small independent states which would become colonies or sub-colonies of other imperialist powers, nor of trying to accomplish a socialist revolution within the bound-

ries of Russia and holding the rest of the Empire in a colonial status.

They proposed the double task of abolishing capitalist domination of colonial peoples and of realizing their independence within a socialist framework. The first involved a fundamental change in the policy of the central government; the second the rapid education of colonial people in the aims and objects of socialism and the development of their capacity for socialist leadership.

Many readers will be familiar with Leonard Barnes's *Soviet Light on the Colonies*; fewer perhaps with that excellent document *The New Teacher in the Arctic* describing the sort of suspicions, prejudices and problems which the early communist pioneers had to face and overcome before the Laplanders became convinced that the new government in Moscow really had a new policy for Lapland and was not the old imperialism in a subtler disguise. There is no more brilliant testimony to the success of those early pioneers than the Russian film, called *Children of the Soviet Arctic*, which dramatized the story of *The New Teacher in the Arctic*. It was made only twenty years after the event, by child and adult actors of the Lapp National Theatre, the children of those primitive igloo-dwellers of the 'twenties giving a performance which stands comparison with any acting in the world.

Soviet colonial policy has been brilliantly successful. It depended in the first place in making clear that there was a clean break between the Imperialist policy of the past and the Communist policy of the future and secondly on releasing the creative energy of the people themselves. The Communists set out to strengthen and develop national cultures, encouraging their enrichment in every possible way. But at the same time, they resolutely attacked superstition, ignorance and traditions which stood in the way of the peoples' healthy development. Because they respected what was respectable, they could mobilize the most intelligent elements in the campaigns against stupidity, filth, magic and blind reverence for obsolete traditions.

People often draw the comparison between the standard of living in the U.S.S.R. and the one in this country, pointing out quite rightly that we have in Britain a much higher standard. But the true comparison is between the U.S.S.R. and the British Empire; and the Russians point out also rightly that nowhere in the Soviet Union, vast though it is, live tribes as primitive as the Pagans of the North Nigerian Plateau and in no republic of the Union is the standard as low as in the Gold Coast where the average income per head is under two pounds a year.

Even in the most backward of the republics, there are great cities now where there were mud villages twenty-five years ago; and among peoples that so recently were illiterate, there are poets, novelists, playwrights and in many places even film studios. And in all these developments, there is a common principle, the development of the latent energy of the people themselves in the construction of a socialist state.

The translation of the Russian Empire into a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics was materially more difficult, but psychologically easier, than the task facing a Socialist Commonwealth. The Russian Empire lay in a single land-mass. The differences between the races of east and west, of north and south, were great. But between the extremes lay all the intermediate types necessary for cohesion.

Then again the violence of the struggle against the counter-revolutionaries and the intervening powers emphasized the break with the past. It was written on the battlefields across two continents. It was in the faces of the new governing class and in the whole method of approach by doctors, teachers and administrators. What superiority they claimed was that of superior knowledge, not of class, race or creed. The pressure of the old régime had been restrictive; that of the new was impulsive. The old officials had wanted to stay in their jobs as long as possible; the new ones were in a hurry to train their successors, so that they could get on to other urgent tasks.

And finally, the forces of reaction had been broken. There were not vested interests, which might be nationalized later, but meanwhile must be kept sweet. Government had complete control of the economic development of the country.

The present Socialist Government of Great Britain, on the other hand, has been returned to carry out a specific mandate. If it does so, successfully, it stands a very good chance of being re-elected for another five years. But that issue will be decided by the electors of Great Britain, most of whom wrongly do not care tuppence about the British Colonial Empire. If they did care, one could be quite sure that in a year and a half's work, more than six and a half hours would have been devoted to the general discussion of Colonial Affairs.

The formulation of a socialist policy for the colonies is not therefore an immediate demand of Labour Party members. And it would encounter strong resistance from the Tories, a large section of the Colonial Office and from the powerful monopolist groups. "So why not," ask the Labour Party members, "let sleeping dogs lie?"

The answer is that it is not the dogs that are sleeping, but the masters. The Colonial peoples themselves are intensely alive and awake. Concessions have been made and more concessions will be extorted. But concessions are no substitute for policy. The Tudor Davies report on the cost of living in Nigeria, while giving a mass of interesting information, contains a naïve expression of surprise that West African capitalists treat their workers even worse than European capitalists, as if the evils of capitalism, that invention of the white man, should not be caught by coloured emulators. In fact, capitalism when caught by a new country tends, like venereal disease in similar circumstances, to develop new and even more virulent forms.

In *not* having a socialist policy for the colonies, we *are* having a capitalist policy; we are, that is to say, promoting the very troubles in our dependencies, which we are trying to overcome at home. I know it will be pointed out that

The Colonial Office now advocates the despatch of skilled trade union and co-operative organizers to the colonies. This is an important step forward; it is not necessarily a socialist step forward. It is merely the continuation of a policy initiated by the Tories and would be necessary whatever the form of government. What is necessary is much more fundamental; nothing in fact less than the liberation of the creative energy of the colonial peoples.

Let us take a very simple example. In Nigeria and the Gold Coast, there are vast areas which suffer from drought during the dry season. Water, however, can be reached at about thirty feet by sinking wells. Two thousand wells are needed immediately in Gold Coast alone. But the Native Administration cannot pursue its well-sinking scheme to full capacity, because of lack of funds. The calls on its small revenue are large. And so for year after year, during the dry season, the fields go unwatered and the women of the villages and compounds have to walk five miles or more to the nearest waterhole and there get water which is foul, brackish and laden with disease.

The cost of digging a well in the Northern Territories of Nigeria is approximately £5, of which five shillings is spent on materials, some fifteen shillings on the wages of the well supervisor and the remainder on wages to the villagers for digging the well from which they themselves will derive the benefit. The reason why these villagers are paid is because Lugard abolished the right of chieftains to demand forced labour from their people, a progressive and sensible measure in itself. But there is a great deal of difference between forced labour and voluntary labour; a great deal of difference between insisting that wages should be paid for public work and failing to instal communal services because there is not enough money to pay the people who would benefit from them.

In order to get more wells more quickly, the Native Administration should explain that priority will be given to those compounds and villages which will give their own labour voluntarily, the Administration merely providing the materials and the supervisor. Even if there were plenty of money to pay for the wells, this scheme would be preferable to payment for work which benefits a single community. It provides a simple example of communal self-help, the exercise of democracy in one of its primary forms. The well becomes a symbol of communal achievement. "We decided that we wanted a well. The Government helped us, but we dug it. It is the expression of our common will."

What a community can do with a well, it can do also with a communal sheep dip or cattle dip; with the building of a schoolhouse, a clinic or a hospital, given the new tools, the use and construction of which can be learnt from the farming centre. The lament of colonial government: "There is not enough money" can become the source of inspiration: "Then let us do it without money." Financial weakness can prove a source of democratic strength. The solution of the small problem can provide the practical edu-

cation which will enable the big problem to be solved, when it arises. If democratic action is learnt at the family compound level, it will automatically spread to the tribal and inter-tribal levels. National unity will arise gradually from co-operation.

Let us be quite clear what the implication is of a very simple action such as the voluntary digging of a compound well. It means sooner or later (I hope sooner), the abolition of indirect rule through chieftains and emirs, the liquidation of the feudal system which has only survived because of the support given by the British. It means a revolution in West African life and a revolution in the thinking of colonial office personnel. It means that instead of ruling by instructions from above, you rule by organization from below. It means that instead of the Colonial Secretary having to issue a grave warning that it is necessary for colonial workers to increase production he must tell them how much help he can give them in their efforts to increase production. It means, in brief, democracy, that extraordinary yeast that will leaven the most unlikely people and produce a dynamic in the most apathetic.

George Hall drew a distinction in his Parliamentary address between economic and political development, saying that at the moment the first was more important than the second. There should, I claim, be no distinction at the primitive level. Political democracy is the villagers voting that they will dig a well or build a sheep dip for their common good.

WHAT HAS UNRRA DONE?

BY W. R. GORDON

UNRRA began at the St. James' Palace Conference in 1941. At that time forty-four nations pledged their support in the Agreement which they signed in 1943, eighteen months before the final defeat of Germany. The objects of the organization, set out in that agreement, were to aid and relieve suffering, to provide food, clothing and shelter, prevent pestilence, help the recovery of health, prepare for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and finally, but possibly most important of all, to assist the resumption of agriculture, industry and essential services. To achieve these aims an international council was set up to direct policy and a director general was appointed to organize the spending and distribution of the vast sums and volumes of goods necessary to afford urgent relief to the stricken countries.

In Governor Lehman, its first Director General and in Mayor La Guardia, who succeeded him; in Sir Frederick Leith Ross, chairman of the European Committee; in that brilliant and capable Australian, Commander Jackson, the Senior Deputy-Director-General and in Lieutenant-General Sir Humfrey Gale, formerly Chief Administrator on General Eisenhower's staff, UNRRA was fortunate to find heads who were capable of wide vision and with the drive and experience necessary to make the new organization fully effective in a short space of time. UNRRA has been criticized in various quarters for the inefficiency of its staff and the wasteful way in which they were used. Yet it must be remembered that, at the time the organization came into being, the man-power position in the countries composing the United Nations was desperate. No doubt, in a hastily collected staff, of so many different nationalities, some undesirable elements crept in, at first. But, as time went on, despite the short-term nature of the employment, men and women of the right calibre were recruited and set to work. Prior to each relief campaign, the necessary teams were assembled and trained for their task. These preparatory planning periods were of great subsequent value.

In its work, UNRRA was designed to operate along very different lines to those of the Hoover Relief Administration set up at the end of the 1914-1918 war. While it was not to be in any sense a supernational body, neither was it to be nationalistic in its outlook and direction. Political discrimination was not to influence relief. Instead the criteria were to be the consent and necessities of those countries requiring relief. This time, too, relief was to be afforded on a free, instead of a credit, basis. Finally, because the destruction and ruin caused by the 1939-1945 war was so much greater than that

25

suffered in the first, food was not to be the sole aid given. A greater attempt at complete relief was to be made.

To finance this gigantic task the countries which had not suffered invasion agreed to contribute one per cent. of their national incomes. Two contributions on this basis have realized more than £900 million during the two short years of UNRRA's span of life. The U.S.A. and Britain have been by far the biggest contributors, giving seventy-three and seventeen per cent. respectively of the total levy raised. The British contribution alone has amounted to £155 million. To this sum Canada, Australia, India, S. Africa and New Zealand have added between them close on £70 million. Thus the English speaking nations combined have contributed by far the largest sums for this task of international relief. Of the remainder Brazil, alone, has been a principal donor.

It has been the feeling that she was "footing" the major portion of the bill which has helped to make America unwilling to see UNRRA continue. In his appeal in November for a world food relief fund, Mayor La Guardia recognized this reluctance by limiting, in his proposals, the contributions from any one country to no more than forty-nine per cent. Other influences which have made the U.S.A. desire to discontinue "blanket" relief schemes have been the ingratitude displayed and the militarism still evinced by those countries which have benefited most. While leading statesmen among several of the chief beneficiaries have paid lip service to the valuable aid rendered to them by UNRRA, they appear from the point of view of donor countries to have forgotten the sacrifices made in making that aid possible.

Measured in terms of money, quite apart from the goods which it produced, the scale of relief has been enormous, though not in relation to the needs of the individual countries. Large and generous though UNRRA's aid has been, it can only be, as Sir Humfrey Gale has put it, an "economic shot in the arm". This must, necessarily, be true of relief, as opposed to the longer-term needs of complete rehabilitation. First among the benefiting countries has been China which has been granted over £130 million worth of relief; then Poland with £117 million; Yugoslavia and Italy with £105 million each; Greece with £86 million; Czechoslovakia £67 million, and Russia (through Byelorussia and the Ukraine) £62 million.

While the generosity of the donor countries cannot be doubted, especially at a time when they were themselves faced with post-war reconstruction problems, it must be remembered that ninety per cent. of their contributions were spent in their own countries. This has meant employment for their work-people and turnover for their industries. Further some of the contributions have taken the form of war surpluses, such as lorries, port repair equipment and similar items. But, whether the donors could afford to give much of this material away or not, it has been a free gift and each receiving country has been able to sell the goods to their own nationals, spending the

ands thus realized on relief and rehabilitation within their own borders. In this manner some currency exchange complications have been overcome.

At its outset UNRRA was faced with very real difficulties. Not only were regions liberated at different times but the transport position in each area proved to be chaotic. Not unnaturally the Army commanders were reluctant to allow civilian organizations to operate on their tenuous lines of communications. Consequently, in the early stages, relief was handled by the Civil Affairs sections of the Armies and only later was UNRRA able to get to grips with its problems. Though created in November 1943, it was not until the spring of 1945 that the first large scale operation could commence, in Greece. This, in fact, was a second attempt for, in December 1944, UNRRA, which had already made a start in that country, had to leave because of the outbreak of civil war. Work began in Yugoslavia in April 1945, in Czechoslovakia in June and in Poland in August of that year. Full-sized operations in Italy did not begin until January 1946 nor in Austria till the following April. To start with, therefore, UNRRA's work was necessarily patchy and its peak period of activity only lasted some fourteen to eighteen months.

Until the end of the Japanese war UNRRA could get neither the ships nor the supplies needed to carry out its task, for they were all required for the prosecution of the war. It was not even possible to marshal supplies or earmark shipping.

As each country requested relief and was approved because of its needs and lack of foreign currency as a worthy object for assistance, and as conditions permitted, so the UNRRA teams started their urgently requested work of rescuing the war-devastated areas from chaos. The task was enormous, desperately complicated and appallingly pressing. Words are not enough to describe the destruction, the poverty, the ill-health, the sheer misery of the populations whom they were called upon to succour.

In Greece there was stark starvation, no fuel, rampant disease, people without houses, besides destruction of railways, bridges and public utility plants. Out of 6,500 villages a quarter was destroyed and over a million people left destitute. The farmers lacked implements, donkeys and seeds. Over the whole country economic life was at a standstill.

Poland, twice a battlefield and with one-third of its thirty-four million people wiped out, was in similar straits. With its transport system shattered, its agriculture and industry paralysed through lack of livestock, agricultural machinery, raw materials and equipment, Poland's national economy had completely broken down. Even in June 1946 it was possible to write that the Poles were ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed. Amid the ruins of Warsaw only a few hundred houses were habitable. Every month 10,000 people were dying from tuberculosis alone. Nearly one and three-quarter million children had been orphaned or had lost one of their parents.

In Yugoslavia more than a million and three quarters, a tenth of the popu-

lation, had been killed in the war. Half a million houses and five thousand public buildings had been destroyed. Whole villages had been destroyed. One village, typical of hundreds, had changed hands forty-eight times in four years and had ceased to exist. In Sarajevo and Zagreb literally hundreds of thousands of people were starving. Typhus and tuberculosis were rampant. As elsewhere, the retreating German armies had destroyed railways, bridges and roads. As if all this were not enough, the country had suffered the worst drought for twenty years.

Even in Czechoslovakia, where less material damage had been suffered than in other countries, there was not a single bridge left intact in the Eastern part of the country. Scores of towns and villages had been bombed or burned and large numbers of people were without not only homes but even shoes and clothing. There was hardly any motor transport and the first UNRRA convoy, landed at the Black Sea port of Constanza and driven 800 miles to Slovakia, was, at one time, the sole means of transport available in the whole country.

To inject the necessary relief into the almost inert mass of suffering humanity it was necessary to send supplies by long and circuitous routes, then the only ways left open. This was the heritage of ruin and suffering with which the newly organized UNRRA had to contend, with all the speed it could summon. Everywhere—in Albania, Austria, Finland, Hungary, and Italy—the tale was much the same, only with more hideous variations. That, amid all the terrible conditions and in face of the real and tremendous difficulties, UNRRA did so much relief work reflects the greatest credit upon those who gave the means, those who organized its allocation and those who had to tackle the heartbreaking jobs on the spot.

To solve these immense problems—and quickly—in Europe alone a staff of 18,000 men and women, of forty-six different nationalities were recruited. The organization had to ship and deliver twenty-two million tons of supplies, at a cost of some £700 million. For procurement and delivery thirty-two countries were involved. Not only was it necessary to order and supply a vast range of commodities but expert help had to be provided in medicine, public health, agriculture, fisheries, raw materials of all kinds, shipping, transportation, harbours and finance. The currency problem alone was enormous.

Four principal branches were set up to organize the work. These comprised supply, relief, finance and administration as well as the controller's department which determined financial spending.

What has UNRRA achieved? Within each country much has been done. For instance, out of one and a half million tons of supplies delivered to Yugoslavia up till May 31, 1946, over one million had been in the form of food, particularly wheat and flour. Raw cotton, wool and rags amounting to nearly 60,000 tons, shipped during April and May last year, enabled the local mills and factories to turn out enough clothing to garb half the populations. Up till then it had been impossible to buy any new clothing at all.

Tuberculosis, which was responsible for seventeen to twenty per cent. of all deaths, had to be fought. At the urgent request of the Yugoslav authorities two mass X-ray units were shipped. To cope with the typhus scourge, which caused 40,000 deaths in 1945, over one and a quarter million lb. of D.D.T. powder and eight anti-typhus units were sent. Nearly fifty 'epidemic' stations are now operating in this country and, in Bosnia, half a million people have been inoculated.

Last year nine million tons of supplies were shipped to Italy, including 1,400,000 tons of coal which, literally, saved the situation. Expenditure on supplies and services for Austria has amounted to £22½ million. About two-thirds of this sum has been spent on food, about £5 million on agricultural items and lesser amounts on clothing textiles, footwear, industrial and medical supplies. Over 1,000 new lorries have been furnished to distribute the goods.

The list of items sent has been enormous. Up till August 31, 1946, over 66,000 lorries, clothing for twenty million people, footwear, leather and hides equivalent to thirty-eight million pairs of boots and shoes, more than one million tons of coal per month, 350 locomotives, 300,000 livestock, 600,000 tons of food or more than 100 liberty ships loads per month, and close on 300,000 tons of raw wool and cotton have been sent to twelve different European countries. There they have been forwarded and delivered by twenty-three UNRRA missions and offices.

Apart from supplies the repatriation of displaced persons has presented a huge problem. From Germany, between May 1945 and August 1946, close on six million prisoners and exiles have been sent home. From Austria, Italy and the Middle East, yet another million have returned to their own countries. About half UNRRA's European staff have been engaged upon this great task.

There can be no doubt that UNRRA has prevented widespread famine and disease in Europe since the war ended. Local starvation and disease there have been, but they have been minimized and prevented from spreading. Much has been done, by the provision of raw materials and technical assistance, to enable countries to help themselves. By the provision of seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, agricultural implements and other necessities an excellent beginning has been made to agricultural rehabilitation.

What remains to be done? All those responsible for UNRRA know that, despite what has been achieved, the job is unfinished. It could not be otherwise. Years of war, oppression and wreckage cannot be remedied in a few months, even of intense effort. There are still nearly three-quarters of a million Poles, Balts and Yugoslavs left as the hard core of the displaced persons problem. These people must either be repatriated or else found alternative homes and work.

Transport, agriculture, industry and health problems still await a complete solution which only additional aid from outside, the work of the nations themselves and time can provide. It is to UNO that the peoples of the war-scarred

countries look to complete the work that UNRRA has started and which cannot be finished without external intervention. All the UNO organizations for this purpose exist on paper only; they are mostly in the talking and planning stage. None has the experienced staff nor the means to take up the task.

As the Polish delegate said at Geneva last August "those who recommend liquidation of UNRRA are like architects who build a house but stop short of the roof." Czechoslovakia, the country most nearly approaching normality, calculates her import and export deficit for 1947 at £47 million. Yugoslavia needs food, clothing, footwear and medical supplies to the extent of £75 million. Austria's needs are computed at between £37½ to £50 million while Italy's import requirements are estimated at between £300 and £350 million.

For health, UNRRA is to hand over to the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization, which will administer the sanitary conventions. In actual fact UNRRA's health work is being almost entirely terminated and the doctors and nurses withdrawn. Anti-malarial and anti-T.B. campaigns are being left half-finished. UNO is only now considering taking over UNRRA's welfare functions but, most probably, this work will end completely. An international refugee organization is to assume responsibility for displaced persons. Up till June 30, 1947, UNRRA will continue this work but after that date all its funds will have been exhausted. Since none of the financial agencies, such as the Monetary Fund and the International Bank, has powers to lend money for buying food and since foreign exchange difficulties are still immense, nations will have to depend upon the goodwill and assistance of those countries, such as the U.S.A., which are able and willing to help them. The Food and Agriculture Organization has scarcely considered the needs of countries hitherto receiving help from UNRRA. So far as children and adolescents are concerned, the International Children's Fund is only just coming to life.

UNRRA staff is, gradually, being demobilized. Despite disparagement of their work these men and women deserve great thanks. When the history of post-war Europe comes to be written due praise will, doubtless, be given to those who conceived the idea of UNRRA and to those who tackled its manifold besetting problems. But those upon whom has devolved the task of post-war statesmanship may well incur blame for not creating an efficient machinery to carry on the work of UNRRA, without interruption, until its final conclusion. It is to UNO and its subsidiary organizations that the war-ravaged countries must now look for assistance. If UNO should fail, it will be completely discredited, the real, lasting revival of international trade will be disastrously delayed and Europe and China may again slide into the chasm from which UNRRA's efforts have raised them.

(As senior British fuel adviser to General Eisenhower, Colonel Gordon saw the start of UNRRA in Europe and has since kept in touch with its work.)

DECLINING VALUES IN CIVILIZATION

BY LEWIS EINSTEIN

SOME very different answers would almost certainly be given to the question of what is the most important feature in the world to-day.

Many might find this in the atomic bomb, others in the deepening rift between East and West, or in the general acceleration of life, or the decay of religion. There is some truth in any or in all of these explanations but future historians may well be of the opinion that more significant than any of these causes is the declining standard of our civilization, and ask why this has happened in our time. It is of course possible to explain this decline by the corrupting evils of Naziism or as pertaining to the aftermath of a world war but there are other reasons as well.

Last July, Sir John Anderson, when opening a new wing of the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, referred to future weapons devised by science which were even more lethal than the atomic bomb and could poison water supplies and spread deadly diseases. Statements of a similar nature have also been heard in the United States. The real significance of these pronouncements made by men of standing was that they provoked so little comment either because they divulged nothing new or more likely because the world has already become accustomed to evil and grown callous to horrors. Nazi crimes have had not a little to do toward shaping this seeming indifference on the part of public opinion. It still is possible for the average man to sympathize with the sufferings of an individual, but multiply this suffering by millions and the horror becomes less moving when it is anonymous and wholesale. The very immensity of the tragedy of our era leaves the imagination so stunned that it can with difficulty react. It would be a paradox, if it were not a truism, to say that the greater the crime the smaller the effect that it leaves on those who have not been the victims. The mind becomes fatigued by the repetition of cruelties and something happens to human sensibility that is akin to what Hitler pointed out regarding the use of a lie which when repeated a thousand times wears down mental resistance and is accepted as truth. Human tragedies enacted on too vast a scale tend in fact to diminish sympathy.

Another reason for the decline of civilization may be discovered in the failure of modern liberalism to act as a fighting creed. During the last century many beneficial measures had been carried out under its banner which the complacent optimism of that age regarded as being permanently secured milestones of progress. When Wilberforce succeeded in abolishing the black

slave trade he would never have believed it possible that a hundred years later white slavery would again be extensively employed in several European countries. The apparent triumphs of nineteenth century liberalism have had much to do with blunting the combative edge of its convictions. At first it merely sank into a comfortable smugness; later, it lost ground slowly at first and then more rapidly under the fierce attacks of a nationalism that emanated from the Right and a socialism from the Left. In every country liberal ideas weakened as a creed but these had so long been associated with Western civilization that their decline suggests, at least, a partial explanation for the lower standards of to-day.

Other reasons can also be found. The growing regimentation of life on the more uniform level imposed by mass pressure almost certainly is one. This question is too extended and too controversial to be discussed here, but it helps to explain the increasingly mechanical nature of modern administration which restricts the latitude that was formerly enjoyed by public men. The consequences of changes now going on in this direction may be good or bad but they register the effects of those growing impersonal forces that everywhere are developing rapidly at the expense of older and more personal ones, so that the qualities demanded of politicians will no longer be the same as in the past.

In theory political science has made no great progress since the days of Athenian democracy. It would be idle to speculate how the mind of Winston Churchill compares with that of Pericles, but there is little reason to suppose that the men who now govern the world are intellectually superior to those of former ages. Yet in the quality of his mind Mr. Churchill is probably nearer to the great Athenian of two thousand years ago than he is to the modern politicians who accept the prefabricated plans of technical specialists that offer ready made substitutes for government. Plutarch attributed virtues such as clemency and generosity to his heroes, but the possession of similar traits would to-day not call for notice and a criterion much more frequently heard refers merely to a statesman's honesty. Politicians in America are still expected to conform, at least outwardly, to certain rather negative requirements of a domestic nature, but even the ideal of a Christian gentleman no longer carries as much weight as it did in the nineteenth century. Probably the intellectual and moral qualities of our public men are regarded as being less important now than before because statesmen in the democratic countries are no longer able to exercise their discretionary powers in the way that they once could do. Almost unnoticed something else has crept in which affects the range of an authority that is increasingly built up with other materials.

A survey of the world leaves one with the uncomfortable feeling that in spite of the efforts of many well-intentioned men in every country civilization is sliding downhill. The principal reason for this decline lies paradoxically in the discoveries of science which more and more must enter into the calculations of public men. General ideas of right and wrong may still be much the same

as they were two thousand years ago, but the application of these ideas has become more restricted and offers little practical guidance when confronted by problems of so unforeseen a nature as the atomic bomb. Many deplore the decay of religious faith and regret that there is no spiritual obstacle to stand in the way of the new Moloch, who threatens the human race, but even a revival of religion would hardly be accompanied by confidence in the voluntary enunciation of the advantages that novel weapons can offer.

It is not easy to foresee how the new Pandora's box which has been opened can ever again be locked. More inventions will certainly elbow their way to compel the attention of governments and no moral restraints are likely to avail in times of crisis to deter a state from utilizing any powers of destruction likely to increase its chances of victory. Bertrand Russell aptly wrote some years before the atomic bomb had been discovered: "In former days men sold themselves to the Devil to acquire magical powers. Nowadays they acquire these powers from science and find themselves compelled to become devils. There is no hope for the world unless power can be tamed . . . for science has made it inevitable that all must live or all must die."

It is something of a paradox that the revolutionary discoveries which tomorrow may result in the end of man and which have led to a serious decline in civilized standards should have emanated from a few men who themselves pursue lives of gentle and peaceful domesticity. Far from being the inventions of Satan, the new instruments of annihilation have originated among a group of scientists of irreproachable character, who in all other respects are ordinary men with a general outlook toward most questions that is probably very similar to that of the majority of their fellow citizens. These men without political ambitions of their own have suddenly come into a prominence that is as unexpected as it has been unsought.

Probably nothing could be further from their present purposes than to demand or to expect political consideration because of scientific skill. None the less inventions which have suddenly compelled the world's attention in the most alarming way, may impose on physicists the choice between remaining pure technicians who are employed only as robots to carry out the orders that they receive or else demanding a share in the control of the terrifying instruments which they have blindly handed over to their governments. The situation is unhealthy in the sense that one group of men possesses the responsibility for the use of far reaching powers that another group has created and given to them without taking any responsibility for their employment. Scientific discoveries that should have been a triumph of civilization have become its curse and a terrible monster has been let loose which no one as yet knows how to curb or to keep under control. A situation so uncertain cannot go on indefinitely, all the more so as new and even deadlier devices will be invented. The public men under whose authority these inventions are developed may discover that their own powers have grown less for they have

to act more as the agents who have control of destructive forces placed in their hands. Deeply conscious as they may be of their responsibilities, their actual power emanates from the fact that they carry a lighted match near a powder magazine.

In one way or another a change must come about if future disaster is to be avoided. Scientists can hardly be expected to cancel out their own discoveries even if such a thing were possible, but no more can they remain indifferent to the dangers that have resulted from these inventions. How they are to indicate this responsibility is hard to say. Good scientists may easily turn into bad politicians and some of them will doubtless burn their hands if they try to branch out in unfamiliar directions, but this does not mean that the effort should not be made. Men of science have a real duty to show that they know how to control and not merely how to devise terrible weapons of destruction.

Already some minor indications point out ways in which their services will be utilized, for scientists are taking part in the discussions of the political Committee of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, although this participation may only be on a technical level. The suggestion has been made that physicists ought to draw up a code of conduct much as physicians and lawyers have done. Measures of this nature usually take time to elaborate and their practical effect is unlikely to keep pace with the giant strides taken by new discoveries. But some form of association already exists and no insuperable obstacle would seem to stand in the way of a union of this character at least in the Western democracies. A beginning was unconsciously made when German, and Austrian, Danish and Italian refugee scientists in the United States contributed their skill in order to help manufacture the atomic bomb. Why should not men of science have the right to advocate common measures and recommend opinions to their governments in the same way as bankers or trades unions? It can neither be expected nor is it desirable that scientists should continue to be used solely as robots in order to prepare measures of destruction of which they disapprove.

It is a sad reflection on our time that the greatest decline in the standards of our civilization has unwittingly resulted from discoveries of science in applying natural forces to unnatural ends. No moral restraint is as yet effective for man's control of these blind forces. The answer if such a restraint is possible lies outside the laboratory, and rests with public opinion, with statesmen, but also with scientists who must not only be specialists but must act also as citizens. At the turning point where we stand to-day science must either remain a blind instrument of power for a new conception of government or one that will aim to utilize its discoveries for the benefit of mankind.

CAN AUSTRIA SURVIVE?

BY P. O. LAPIE

FOR centuries Austria existed only by virtue of the Holy Roman Empire. It was then looked upon as the Far East of Europe, so that a prince standing on the terraces of Vienna, could point to where the Danube was lost on the horizon and say: "My son, here Asia begins." When the Holy Roman-Germanic Empire broke up, the possibility of Austria's survival might already have been questioned, and indeed it was thought that Austria would continue to exist only as the equal of one or other of the German principalities.

Throughout the nineteenth century the dual monarchy was confronted almost daily with the problem of its own survival; the difficulties resulting from the revolutions of 1848, the defeat at Sadowa, the victories of the democracies, and the growth of nationalism, seemed likely still further to wound and finally to despatch altogether the two-headed eagle. But it lived on, under the domination of the Emperor Francis Joseph for the best part of another century.

After 1918 the problem presented itself in a still more acute form. The Austro-Hungarian monarchy was not only the major casualty of the war, but Austria was the nation which suffered the greatest dismemberment. With the liberation of Czechoslovakia, the formation of an independent Hungary, the reconstitution of Poland, the extension of the Rumanian and Yugoslavian frontiers, and the ceding to Italy of the irredentist territories, what remained of the Austro-Hungarian empire was only Austria itself with its six million inhabitants—little more than a sprawling suburb of Vienna.

At that time Austria was not deeply stirred politically. She believed in the inevitable necessity and the incontestable success of the democracies, and in the possibility of a new life for Austria under the federal constitution of October 1, 1920 [revised in 1925 and in 1929]. But from the first the diplomats of all nations concentrated on her economic and not her political problems, for the instability of the Austrian economy was only too apparent. Hence the international loans and other evidences of outside support which came to the rescue of the Austrian economy, and without which, it was said, Austria could not have survived.*

At the present time we have once again to face the problem of Austria's continued existence, but to-day the problem is not, as it was in 1918, primarily

* Note.—Loans to aid Austria amounted during the years following 1918 to a sum of 125 million dollars, or twenty dollars per head of the population.

an economic one. It is mainly a political problem, and even an international political problem.

A recent visit to study conditions in the French zone and in Vienna, has allowed me to collate facts which represent something more than mere reporting.

* * * * *

Austria is no longer the economically weak country which was the object of foreign concern after the 1914-1918 war. The country has been industrialized, first by its own efforts, and later, after 1938, by the Germans. In certain respects it has even been over-equipped for the immediate ends of war, but under conditions which can be utilized for a peace economy. However that may be, the economic face of Austria has been transformed between 1918 and 1946. Let me give a few examples to support this statement.

Among the natural riches, timber comes first. Despite intensive exploitation under the Nazi occupation, the timber industry in the French zone is working to capacity, thanks to the reconversion of the armament factories. The exploitation of lignite and coal was moderate, but since the cessation of hostilities the output of lignite alone would be sufficient to ensure Vienna's gas and electricity supply.

Again, the production of hydro-electric power—which Austria had been able to increase between 1932 and 1936, raising it from 2,300,000 kilowatts to 2,680,000—was augmented between 1936 and 1941 by twenty-seven per cent. The plan is being carried on by the construction of two dams in Styria and Upper Austria. Let me note in passing that more than half the production of current is furnished by the French zone.

Petroleum, discovered at Zistersdorf before the *Anschluss*, yielded 33,000 tons in 1937. But the Germans raised production in 1940 to 1,000,000 tons and in 1944 to 1,200,000 tons. Present production, resumed by the Russians a fortnight after their entry, would be 40,000 tons per month, that is to say, nearly 500,000 tons a year, which is sufficient to meet the civil needs of Austria. Austria now ranks third among the petroleum producing countries of Europe [the U.S.S.R. and Rumania being the first and second] since Galicia suffered so severely from the war.

The output of mineral wealth—iron, magnesite, lead, zinc, graphite and copper, all very important before the *Anschluss*—was still further increased under the Nazi régime by the compulsory amalgamation of undertakings. Moreover, a considerable exploitation of bauxite [aluminium] was added. The figure for extraction of iron, for example, under the German régime was more than 2,000,000 tons.

In the textile and leather industries the ravages of war have been comparatively slight, but they have been heavy in the chemical industry which, largely

uilt up under the German régime, seems to have suffered the greatest damage.

Owing to the secrecy which surrounded German war production, it is not possible to assess accurately to what extent the metallurgical industries have increased their production, but the proportion must be considerable. Austria became the air-raid shelter for German industry, not only by the increase of production, but by the transfer of factories and machines, the construction of buildings, underground factories, etc.; with the Hermann Goering works at Linz and Steyr, aeroplane works at Wiener-Neustadt and Neudorf, tanks and lorries at Vienna, and radio equipment and accessories in the Alps.

In 1937 Austria produced 389,000 tons of cast iron, 650,000 tons of raw steel, and 434,000 tons of rolled and wrought iron. A Swiss observer has estimated that the productive capacity of Austria's industry increased between 1938 and 1944 by as much as two-thirds.

Without laying too much emphasis on this increase in output, and making every allowance for the continued shortage of agricultural produce, existing labour and reconstruction problems, the complications arising from zones of occupation, and the obvious burden of reparations, I consider that—contrary to the view taken by the Austrian Economic Institute, which relies chiefly on calculations made at Vienna and in the Russian zone—Austria has been industrially re-equipped by Germany [see especially the figures for petroleum, electrical energy and metallurgy] and its economic potential considerably increased in relation to 1937 and still more in relation to 1918.

Its economic difficulties are those of all countries emerging from war and in a state of transition. Essentially the situation is no longer that of 1918. The Austria of 1946 is economically strong.

* * * * *

Although, as I have said, Austria is to-day economically sound, she is politically menaced. This political threat does not seem to be due to internal causes. The Habsburgs and the Archduke Otto have ceased to matter. The fascists are kept at a respectable distance by de-Nazification, slow and lax as this may appear. The communists secured only a limited number of votes at the general election. The Austrian Federal Republic, then, moves towards its political reconstruction under the tripartite banner of the parties authorized by the occupying powers, seeking its destiny, which can only be a return to the constitution of 1929.

It is in the international sphere and from the attitude of the Allies that Austria fears the threat to her independence, her integrity, and even her very existence.

All began well and all is still well *in theory*. The Moscow declaration of November 1, 1943, proclaimed that Austria would be reconstituted after the defeat of Germany and would be "free and independent". The Austrian Republic thought it would be able to rely on this solemn assurance of the three

Allies and that France, once re-established, would endorse it. But three main factors have arisen which have caused misgivings. The first is the settlement of the southern Tyrol question in favour of Italy; the second is the interpretation given in Austria to a passage from a speech made by Mr. Bevin, the British Foreign Minister, on July 25, 1946; and the third is the attitude and behaviour of the Russians in regard to the nationalization law.

To offset these three causes of anxiety, we can put forward the control agreement of June 28, 1946, which substituted for the occupation and its system of direct administration, a less onerous form known as "control".

The southern Tyrol, which during the last few centuries has so often been the object of bargaining between various interested parties, was promised to Italy by the London Pact of April 26, 1915, and accorded to that power by the Treaty of St. Germain: that meant for Italy the Dolomites, the tourist centres, the hydro-electric works, and, above all, the Brenner frontier.

On November 16, 1945, Dr. Gruber, Austrian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in a note addressed to the Allied Control Council, asked for the restitution of the southern Tyrol to Austria [confirmed by a memorandum of May 13, 1946], but on June 24, 1946, the council of four rejected the claim of the Vienna Government. This check to Austrian diplomacy offended Tyrolean sentiment and was regarded as a reflection on the integrity of Austria and, in any case, as a proof of the Allies' lack of good will towards them.

This impression was confirmed when, in the House of Commons, on July 25, 1946, Mr. Bevin made a declaration relating to the frontiers of various countries, and of Austria in particular. He recalled that while the Moscow declaration of 1943 had to take into consideration the terms of the armistice with Italy, no one had stipulated that there should be no revision of frontiers. Austria was not then liberated* and it was not then known whether eastern Austria might not be separated.

It was this passage which aroused so much feeling, for it seems that in translation the past tense was replaced so effectively by the present tense that Mr. Bevin's declaration [which in reality announced the continuation of his policy with regard to Trieste] was interpreted in the following sense: "Austria is not *free*, and it is not yet known if eastern Austria [that is to say, the Russian zone] *will* not be separated from Austria."

Some days later the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, had to make a statement to clarify the position. In spite of this the impression remains in Austria, and even in certain chancelleries, that Mr. Bevin had allowed it to be understood that the eastern frontiers of Austria would be modified.

Finally, the third reason for misgiving, and not the least, is that which arises from the Russian attitude, in particular from the Russian opposition to the nationalization law.

* The word can be translated "liberated" or "free".

In order to understand the matter better, it is necessary to recall two things. First, that the Russian zone embraces part of Vienna, and Austria east of Vienna. Second, that the Yalta Agreement [on the principle of reparations in kind] and the Potsdam Agreement [according eastern reparations to the U.S.S.R.] confer on the U.S.S.R. a right to reparations in kind from Austria. Consequently, at the end of hostilities, the Russians, considering Austria as Nazi territory, applied in an arbitrary manner the rule which permitted them to take booty in the territory which they occupied—factories, equipment, transfer of machinery, stocks, etc. The control agreement of June 28 expressly reserves to the Allies the right of disposal of German property in Austria in payment of reparations.

But the Allies [other than the Russians], who are considered as trustees for the eighteen nations, have a right to the foreign credits of Germany in western Austria under the heading of Western Reparations [Ordinance No. 5 of the Allied Command in Germany]. France has a right to sixteen per cent. of these reparations since the Paris reparations conference of December 1945.

But to come back to the Russians: the Austrian Government introduced a law, called the nationalization law, adopted on July 26, 1946, which affects the Allies in so far as it concerns German property. But what is German property and from what date is it to be fixed? For there have been forced sales, requisitions, hidden assets, etc.

The U.S.S.R., with a military occupation stronger than that of the other Allies, carries out seizures in its zone regardless of the origin of the property. And these properties are of great value. The *Arbeiter Zeitung*, the Vienna socialist paper, in its issues of August 17 and 18, 1946, gives a long list of them. But to understand the importance of the matter, it will be sufficient to recall that the petroleum concerns of Zistersdorf, the Danube Navigation Company and the Land Bank have their offices and principal works in the Russian zone. At the Allied council, therefore, the representative of the U.S.S.R. opposed the law, but since there were no other dissentients and the Allied veto on Austrian legislation has to be unanimous, the law came into force on the expiration of the agreed period, that is to say, on September 9. It seems unlikely that this law will be put into effect in the Russian zone, although in the British and American zones there will be no objection to it. While in the French zone reserves have been made concerning the right to reparations and the protection of French interests [Declaration of the Austrian Government of September 7, 1946].

Those are the three causes of misgiving in Austria at the present time, and one can see that the last is not the least. It is notorious that the Austrians have the impression that the U.S.S.R. will not quit her occupation zone and that she wishes to hold on to Vienna, the indispensable key to her influence in the Danube basin.

Thus the problem presented in the Byrnes-Wallace controversy—UNO or

zones of influence—faces us not merely in a speech, but in the very heart of a city in ruins, occupied by four nations and marking the extreme limit of the victorious wave of the Red Army; and the vexed questions of the withdrawal of occupation troops and the surrendering of influence, which have been brought before UNO and the security council in regard to Iran, Indo-China, Syria and Greece, arise much nearer home—in Austria, in the heart of Europe itself.



In the face of such a clash of interests, what is the solution? Since the problem is international, we must act on the international plane.

There is not much that can be done in Vienna itself, for there the man in the street, like the Government, asks himself whether the U.S.S.R. is not permanently installed in Austria, and in order to remove that doubt, it will be necessary to terminate the Allied occupation. A year of occupation should have been time enough for each of the Allies to take what they wanted in the way of reparations in kind.

But, above all, it is UNO itself which must frankly face the question whether the veto system—incorporated in the pact by the U.S.S.R., used by that power, and introduced by them into the Allied Council for Austria—can, in its present rigid form, be a really acceptable method for international collaboration.

In Austria there are numerous elements which are ready to work for the peace of Europe and the reconstruction of their country. The economic potential of Austria has been increased by the circumstances of war and the Nazi occupation, and Austria ought to profit by it herself and at the same time benefit the European economy.

There is surely no need for Austria's political life to be endangered because of words badly translated; because of precipitate action; or because of the policy of a power conforming perhaps to the expansionist doctrine of the revolution, but certainly disquieting to international peace.

Let us hope that from the height of the crumbling pavilion of Schoenbrunn these words may never again be spoken: "My son, here Asia begins."

(The author was the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Monsieur Blum's Socialist Government which took office in December, 1946. When a member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly, Monsieur Lapie was chosen to be one of a special Commission of Inquiry into Austrian Affairs.)

THE OTHER ISLAND

BY HONOR TRACY

THE good Englishman who comes to southern Ireland is determined to behave correctly. He knows that the country is sovereign and free.

He knows that the mail boat now docks, not at Kingstown, but at Dun Laoghaire. He sees that buses and telephone booths are painted not a staring red, but a soft and pleasant green, and bear upon them incomprehensible words in a beautiful script. He stands to attention for The Soldier's Song, and raises his hat when the President, kind little old Sean T. O'Kelly, passes in the State coach, preceded and followed by roughly twice the number of mousers that attend the King of England. He reminds himself that this is a foreign country and that he is not only a visitor but a privileged visitor, for he has to comply with none of the regulations and suffer none of the restrictions laid as a rule upon men abroad, and which give to modern travel its vividly nightmarish quality. Loyal he accepts the position, eagerly adheres to form: and all the while, feeling as much at home as in Cornwall or Yorkshire, he is conscious of taking part in an elaborate game of make-believe.

Dublin is a city lovelier than any in the three kingdoms but it is not a foreign city. The apparent strangeness of it is only the strangeness of Rome: the priests, nuns and friars, intent on their salvation, the soft incessant tolling of church and monastery bells, the beggars, poverty and dirt give the city not a foreign but a medieval character: the Middle Ages are alive here still, with their helplessness before material things, their faith and love. Dublin is English, as Bath and Gloucester are English, and every street and every square hold memories of our common history. The same is true of the towns throughout the country, and of the countryside itself, with its hideous new villas, its tidy farms and mellow country houses. It takes more than a Celtic cross here or a round tower there to convince the Englishman that he is abroad: even the wild mountainous districts of the west appear as no more than the exotic fringe, as Wales and the Hebrides are the exotic fringe, to something familiar and homely: and "the people in the uplands digging praties" speak a language that, as well as the English, the bulk of their compatriots do not know.

There is rather more to it, however, than superficialities of this kind. Indeed, an Irish patriot might take grave exception to their being mentioned at all. He could argue that any country would bear the imprint of its oppressors, after seven hundred years. It was only to be expected that Irish

cities should be peppered with the monuments of English savagery, like, for instance, the Zoo or the Royal Society Building or the Botanical Gardens, in Dublin. We might make him very angry indeed: we should be fortunate to escape before the conversation turned on Cromwell. And if there were nothing but appearances to go on, perhaps he would be right, but there are a number of other factors which lend a bogus air to the official asseverations of distinctness and independence.

For one thing, the country suffers from a kind of schizophrenia, a split within itself. The split is caused by the remnants of the Protestant ascendancy, or gentry, who are contemptuously referred to as 'West Britons' by the true Gaels, whom they, in turn, describe as 'the people here' or 'the natives'. This minority, like all minorities, gets a fair and decent treatment in the new Ireland, or at any rate is entitled to it by the Consitution, but they have not so far been able to adapt themselves and live in a state of chronic disparagement. Curiously enough, it is from these people that the English get their traditionally romantic idea of the dare-devil Irishman, the average Celt being about as wild and dashing as a Swiss. Their sons and daughters joined the services: they speak of 'the King', 'the Army', 'the Empire': their hearts are across the water. They are more true-blue than any English Tory: frequently, while over here, it has been my happiness to see some American or Indian or German hurry up to one of them for a chat about British Imperialism, only in the next instant to reel back as if he had trodden on a viper. A good deal of the anti-English feeling here is really a class-resentment, directed against this formerly possessing and governing, and still extremely snobbish, caste, which has always identified itself with England and who now seem to belong nowhere, for the England to which they are loyal and for which they fought so gallantly and freely exists no more. Yet dwindling in numbers and with no future ahead, they contrive somehow to hang on and to contribute to Irish life whatever it still has of grace and panache.

And then again, of course, there is the ambiguous attitude of the Irish Government itself. Mr. de Valera has never finally closed the door on the British Empire. While he takes every opportunity of underlining the fact that Eire is a republic and, as we know, holds that the obligations of Commonwealth members do not devolve upon her, he is prepared to accept in full the benefits which those members receive. For instance, he is quite pleased that England should solve his unemployment problem for him. This means rather more than the mere shipping across the water of batches of potato-pickers and navvies; it also means that Irish intellectuals, doctors and lawyers and journalists, may come over and earn fees and salaries far beyond the resources of their own country. Prosperity is added to Ireland by the money they send home, and a possible, intellectual opposition to the lazy and selfish policies of Finna Fail is removed: and Mr. de Valera does not forbid it. As citizens of Eire, they are entitled in many cases to a British passport, and Mr. de

alera does not forbid them to ask. And why should they not? Irishmen are always welcomed and appreciated in England and they have qualities of heart and mind which England sorely needs at the moment: they hold, for instance, that the emergency order is made for man and not man for the emergency order, and they are unimpressed even by serried rows of geniuses in peaked caps: moreover, the foreign elements in a society all make it lively and interesting—even if of recent years they have been a little exaggerated: but it is somewhat perplexing to find at the same time the legend of complete independence vigorously maintained, together with a malevolent neutrality in her affairs. To take one case among many, there is a young woman here who was entirely pro-German throughout the war, rejoicing in British defeats and wearing a wastika in her button-hole, and who has now written to a theatrical concern in England asking for a job. No doubt she will get it and make a valuable contribution and, we hope, find friends and be happy: and presently, when it suits her, she will come home again and start beating on her drum where she left it off. In the same way, journalists bitterly anti-English in their articles, admirers of Franco and Mussolini, still a-boil over the events of 1921, are ready to go over and write in any style that may be required of them. From the head of the Government to the humblest peasant in Donegal there appears to be a conviction that the pagan State across the water is there to help them out when they run short of money.

Quite apart from matters of this sort, however, which are largely matters of taste, there is altogether a curious mental atmosphere in Ireland to-day, a kind of persistent unreality; a stranger has the feeling that the country is not so much out of step with the world as outside it altogether, asleep in a bubble of her own imagining. Extreme cynicism is the note in private, extreme naivety in public, discussions of foreign affairs: in neither case do the speakers give the impression of having their feet upon the ground. To take an example, there is no way in which the Irish revealed their state of mind more clearly than in their use of the word 'Belsen'. Irritated and excitable individuals used it in their letters to the press, complaining of trifling discomforts in a train or bus. Nationalists described their experiences in British detention camps in the two wars and ended up ingenuously "and then you people talk about Belsen." During an angry exchange in the Dáil some time ago concerning the convict Sean McCaughey, who had tortured a man to death, but for political reasons, and so regarded himself as a political prisoner and chose to starve rather than wear prison clothes, more than one Deputy referred to the 'Belsen' conditions in the Maryborough gaol. We know what Belsen means to the people of Europe: to the Irish, it is simply a foreign word, a colourless term of opprobrium, vaguely associated with things that are unpleasant and uncomfortable. Their remoteness from the world of to-day in all its pain, their ignorance, must surely be without equal among civilized nations. Of course, we all know the man who asserts that a barefoot peasant he met in Connemara

accurately forecast Mr. Vishinsky's policy in Paris to him, or that more informed political gossip is to be heard in a certain Dublin bar he knows than among the table at a UNO banquet: but somehow one never meets that particular peasant, one never happens on that bar. Instead, one opens a paper to read in it a letter explaining that a good way to end wars would be for Eire to abolish her standing army; or hears from the pulpit that Eire's exclusion from UNO was due to Russia's hatred and fear of the land of saints and scholars as a stronghold of Christianity. At the same time, their leaders and particularly their religious leaders are at pains to reassure the people that they are all right, that they are *bien vu* by the Almighty and that what has happened elsewhere has been owing to the fact that the peoples have wandered from Irish standards of behaviour. It is no very uncommon experience to find a cleric asserting that Holy Ireland was spared the horrors of war because she was good and Catholic and went to Mass on Sundays; and it is a startling experience to an outsider, for the holiness of Ireland is somewhat like the divinity of the Japanese Emperor: it is not manifest. It does not become apparent from a study of relative crime statistics nor does it force itself upon the consciousness in the every day conduct of affairs. It is a dogma, to question which is the sign of a certain crudity, like the crudity of St. Thomas, and it is a dogma which has claimed some very notable adherents. "Holy and beautiful is the soul of Catholic Ireland!"—the words are taken not from a papal address of goodwill but from a political tract from George Bernard Shaw.

This is not to suggest for a moment that all Irish people, or even most of them, accept these explanations *ex cathedra* or otherwise. Their relation to the clergy is a charming and complex one, too complex to examine here: but it may be said that on the whole they are even more gaily cynical about their spiritual leaders than about foreign statesmen. I shall always remember the case of the Bishop of Galway who, in a political speech in his Cathedral last April, made the arresting statement that the left wing parties had started the Civil War in Spain and that the elections of 1936 there had been faked. I raised my eyebrows at this, like any Saxon prig, but Irish friends, Catholic and Protestant, put forward an explanation both kindly and reasonable: "the poor decent man has to earn his living like the rest of us. We know he is not speaking the truth but he has to do it." What could be more attractive than this idea of a gracious and poised society where the Bishop, on the one hand, has what he needs and the people, on the other, are not misled? and yet what also, could be more revealing than the indifference to fact which underlies it? The complexities of the Spanish affair, which, epitomizing the drama of the century, have remained sharply defined in European minds for a decade, here fade away almost to the realm of the subjective: lucidly and sympathetically appreciated is the dilemma of the Bishop.

While a haze gathers about its view of the world at large, there seems to be a corresponding, artificial attempt to rally the nation's self-conceit. The Church

tells the people that they are very good and they tell themselves that they are very clever. On paper, let it be said again: in private conversation they are very given to self-disparagement. A debating society will propose the theme 'Ireland, leader of the World Renaissance' or 'Ireland, bridge of the gulf between Britain and the U.S.A.' and examine it without apparent misgiving. The tendency is perhaps most marked in the literary field. There is something highly comic about the tone of patronage adopted by many Irish critics in discussing English or American or even French work. No one will deny that the achievement of Irishmen, or rather of Anglo-Irishmen, in letters has been a glorious one in the past, and out of all proportion to their numbers. At present, however, there is little creative work of any quality done in Ireland at all, at least not by writers under forty. The work done by the young painters is interesting, original, sophisticated, able to hold its own anywhere, but that of young writers is imitative and formless, reeking either of the bog or of America. Some people think the system of education, some the censorship, others the Church, is to blame for this dearth; most likely it is simply a natural pause, a nation being able no more than a tree to flower the whole year round. But the critics here do more than survey the work of foreigners from an immense height: they fly into a veritable rage if anyone questions the value of a local product. A comment by Seán O'Faoláin that Irish poetry had somewhat fallen off since the day of Yeats, A.E., Ledwidge and Synge filled the columns of the *Irish Times* with angry buzzing for the best part of three weeks. The names of various parish rhymsters were pushed forward and their brilliance categorically affirmed: "if I say 'tis, 'tis, whether 'tis or 'tisn't." It is dogma, once more, and dogma is unreality: it is the official myth in which no one believes. This detachment from the standards of objective criticism is common in nations that live with their back turned to the world: we are reminded again, as we so often are in Ireland, of the Japanese: and it is aggravated here by a sense of having dropped out of things and ceased to count.

The feeling of a great anti-climax is, I think, the clearest feature of Irish life to-day. The tremendous fuss over anniversaries, the elaborate radio programmes that commemorate yearly the rising in Easter week 1916, the perennially fiery speeches over the graves of patriots, all spring surely from a sense that nothing more has to happen. Ireland had the interest and the sympathy of the world in her relation to England. She was the thorn in England's side, the stick with which England might be beaten, when England was on the crest of the wave. Politically she had no existence otherwise than as an English problem. Now that the revolution has cut her adrift, and pushed into the shadow the class which had placed her intellectually and artistically on the map: and that no more capital can be made either out of English wickedness or Irish grief: and that the romance of martyrdom is ended, and that the poetry of revolution has given way to the prose of day-to-day affairs, Ireland is no more than a small island that lies out in the Atlantic, inhabited by some three

or four million people, mostly peasants, with the standards in behaviour, art and politics that peasants have.

A revolution that comes off is apt to be a dismal thing. Nothing could be more ironic than to read over, to-day, the pamphlets written by A.E. in the times of insurgence: and nothing could be more wholesome for the English Whig, that fancy-free individual, to whom all geese are swans as long as someone torments them, than to come here and see what seven hundred years of glorious struggle can culminate in. There is a Government devoted not to the interests of the country as a whole but to those of the new ruling-class of *petit bourgeois* tradesmen they have called into being. While dirty, ragged and sore-eyed children roam the streets barefoot through the coldest days of winter, families are evicted from miserable tenements and men are stopped the dole because they hold a horse's head or carry a bag for a shilling, these shop-keepers are making more money than ever before. The alleged prosperity of Eire is no more than the reflected glow of their complacency. The Church, so glorious under persecution, so admirable in minority, here is like a dead weight on the country, stifling thought and destroying the will, enforcing her wishes and revenging herself upon opposition in often the meanest and shabbiest of ways: hand-in-hand with the Government, safe from attack, beyond criticism: aware of the corruption in high places, but always ready to shame the simple folk of parishes by reading their sins from the altar. There is a censorship whose caprices, however diverting, are too well-known to require a new description. There is a society that is dull, nerveless, money-minded and horribly prim, in which a man of integrity appears exotically like an orchid in a bed of dandelions or perversely like one bent at all costs on being different. And all this is accepted by the citizenry clear-sightedly and with a spate of humorous and intelligent comment: and, at the same time, with a spiritless docility which makes one wonder how they ever came to be regarded as people of a generous, if sometimes rather tiresome, courage.

The good Englishman, however, will remind himself that it is no longer any concern of his.

THE NATIONALIZATION OF TRANSPORT

BY HERBERT T. BANYARD

IN the last hundred years few of the industrial undertakings of this country have taken up so much parliamentary time as the railways. At the time of their inception and development they were regarded as monopolies and as such were subjected to varying degrees of statutory control. In return for passing the enabling Acts necessary for their existence the legislature insisted that reasonable facilities must be offered to the trading community for the conveyance of goods, prohibiting oppressive contracts and imposing restrictive conditions on charges. In the nineteenth century a thousand-odd of these controlling Acts found their way into the statute book. The recent allocation of more parliamentary time for the consideration of the Transport Bill merely continues the tradition.

Seldom has the opposition to such a measure been conducted with so much ferocity. This is not surprising, for the Bill with its 127 clauses and thirteen schedules provides the legal basis for a publicly-owned system of inland transport. It will extend nationalization with few exceptions to all railways and their ancillary undertakings: goods, passenger transport, canals, docks and harbours. At the present time these undertakings employ about a million people, approximately six per cent. of our working population. The sum of £1,000,000,000 will be required to compensate the existing rail and canal stock-holders. In addition, an undetermined amount will have to be found for the compensation of the road hauliers who will be absorbed under the Bill.

Its main provisions deal with the setting up of a Transport Commission to which would be transferred on January 1, 1948, all the acquired undertakings. It would consist of a chairman and four other members who would be responsible to the Minister of Transport for matters of policy. The managerial control of the differing concerns would be shared by five executives dealing respectively with railways, docks and inland waterways, road transport, London transport, and hotels. The separation of the executive task of management from the Commission should leave the latter free to confine itself to the promoting of an efficient and adequate system of inland transport and dock facilities in the United Kingdom. There is, however, a vital obligation laid upon the Commission so to conduct the various undertakings that the revenue received "is not less than sufficient for making provision for the meeting of charges properly chargeable to revenue taking one year with another."

All road haulage concerns mainly engaged in long distance haulage under

A and B licences will be acquired. Certain classes of operators are excluded, that is, furniture removers, carriers of liquids in bulk, meat, livestock and heavy indivisible loads. After January 1, 1948, it will be a condition of the issue of A and B licences that the working distance of the operatives outside the control of the Commission will be limited to twenty-five miles from their base. In respect of goods vehicles functioning under a C licence by ancillary users, that is, traders using vehicles for the carriage of goods in connection with any trade or business carried on by them, the limit of operation will be forty miles from their base.

It is provided that permission may be granted to C licence holders to operate in excess of forty miles if it can be shown that such an operation is necessary to maintain, say, a continuous manufacturing process between two factories. Permission will also be granted if the goods of the trader are especially fragile or in certain circumstances where the cost of packing would be prohibitive. Against the refusal of permission there lies an appeal to the Minister. In passing, it might be noted that the farming community will enjoy considerable freedom under the Bill. To quote the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport: "A farmer taking his own produce in his own vehicle does not require to have a C licence at all. Therefore he is able to take his own produce in his own vehicle 400 miles if he wants to without asking anyone's permission."

At the moment it is not proposed to take over road passenger transport services but the Commission is empowered to promote area schemes after consultation with the local authorities with a view to "the co-ordination of the passenger transport services serving the area."

Apart from the general objections advanced against the Bill two specific lines of attack have emerged: (1) on the mileage restrictions imposed on the road haulier and especially those directed against the C licence holder, and (2) on the terms and conditions of compensation. The consideration of the second point will be dealt with later in this article but for a full understanding of the former it is now necessary to digress somewhat to study the effect of road competition on the railways between 1921 and 1939.

After the 1914-1918 war the Government decided on the amalgamation of the 120 companies then operating railways and in pursuance of this object passed through Parliament the Railways Act of 1921. This had the effect of reducing the number of operating companies into four main groups. At the same time the Act set up a new quasi judicial body called the Railway Rates Tribunal, vesting in it wide authority to deal with all matters of railway rates and charges. The railway companies submitted to the tribunal a system of rates and charges designed to produce revenue at the rate of £51,000,000 per annum, this figure being known as the Standard Revenue. After much inquiry and controversy the new rates received statutory authority which came into force on January 1, 1928, and were known as Standard Charges. Publicity had

to be given to these new rates and the railway companies were compelled to keep rate books open for the inspection of any interested party at each station where goods were received for conveyance. It is interesting to note that this standard Revenue was never earned in any year by the four groups and despite an increase of five per cent. in their rates in 1937 they incurred each year a deficit running into many millions. The Act of 1921 gave the railways power, subject to the permission of the Railway Rates Tribunal, to carry certain traffic at rates lower than the standard operating for that class of traffic. These were known as exceptional rates and it has been computed that in the years 1930-1938 eighty per cent. of all traffic was conveyed at these rates.

The effects of these deficits were shown in the dividend policies of the companies, the junior stocks receiving little or no return during these years, while at the same time the amounts available for obsolescence and renewals were limited. This fall in revenue can be traced to two main causes: the general trade depression between the wars and the growth of road transport competition. The road haulier, free from the onerous liability of the common carrier and under no obligation to publish rates, was thus able to compete very effectively with rail transport. Road charges were and are still based on the cost of carrying while the structure of railway rates is based on the value of the consignment as well as the cost of conveying it. As a result, road charges are less than rail charges for the more valuable goods and more than rail for the less valuable. Road hauliers therefore competed successfully for those goods which are found in the expensive categories of railway rates. Thus the fact that the rates for conveyance by rail were cheaper than the equivalent rates by road meant that the low-rated commodities, like coal and iron ore, were left to the railways to carry, not because the road haulier did not desire to participate in this class of traffic but because his rates for it were not competitive. It therefore followed that any increase in the number of road hauliers would result in a further loss of remunerative traffic from rail to road.

So far as I know, no figures are available to show the amount received by the railway companies for the conveyance of each class of traffic or the relation of the receipts to the cost of conveyance. It is not however unfair to suggest that the raw materials for the basic industries were in part subsidized by the higher grades of traffic. The revenue necessary for railway solvency was obtained by a delicate combination of income from all classes of traffic. The advent and growth of the road haulier, who took the most remunerative traffic and operated in the main on those routes where an adequate amount of two-way traffic could be obtained, brought the railway companies to a serious financial crisis.

To deal with the results of this free competition, so disastrous to the railways so long as their rate structure remained unmodified, the Government instituted an inquiry into road and rail transport. The result of much deliberation was the production of the Salter Report, the main recommendations of

which were incorporated in the Road and Rail Traffic Act of 1933. This provided for the first time in this country a system of goods vehicle licensing. The Act laid down that "no person shall use a goods vehicle on a road for the carriage of goods (a) for hire or reward or (b) in connection with any trade or business carried on by him except under licence." Three kinds of licences were granted: A/road haulier, B/limited carrier and C/ancillary user. They were granted for a period to hauliers operating at a certain date but subsequent entrance into the industry was severely limited. New applicants had to show that real need existed for the services they proposed to offer. It was not sufficient to assert that refusal to grant the licence would cause inconvenience generally. At the public hearing of these new applications it was quite usual to find objections raised against the granting of the licence not only on the part of the railways but also on behalf of the established haulier. Despite the limiting factors of the licensing regulations and the increased taxation of motor vehicles and fuel the position so far as the railways were concerned deteriorated steadily.

In 1938 the railways launched their 'square deal' proposals, seeking relief from the statutory regulation of charges and freedom to decide for themselves the rates to be charged for the conveyance of merchandise. The advent of the war blocked any statutory relief but in view of the experience gained as to the effect of even regulated competition on the structure of railway finance it is understandable that the terms of the present Transport Bill are designed to integrate both road and rail systems into a unified whole.

It is pertinent however to inquire if this measure will provide the flesh and blood of a transport system so attractive to the trading community that they will of their own volition use the services offered. Time and experience alone can answer this query. Meanwhile, there would appear to be little objection to an amendment designed to restore the freedom of the C licence holder. The right 'as of right' to acquire his licence and to operate as many vehicles as his business requires without mileage restrictions would be a concession that should be a measure of the Minister's confidence in the ultimate success of his new undertaking. At present the conditions under which traders may apply for permission to operate their own vehicles beyond the prescribed limit are clearly laid down in the Bill. But these concessions may be worthless if, as it appears, the Bill provides that the Commission can exercise what is virtually a veto by representing that the contemplated permit will affect adversely the new monopoly. In view of this situation it is not surprising that the trader operating vehicles at present under a C licence considers that these safeguards are more apparent than real. Is the Minister's objection to accepting such an amendment due to his fear that the industrial community might, by a substantial increase in the number of road vehicles, attempt to sabotage the new undertaking? If this is so, then the point might be met by a compromise whereby the concession would be limited to the 149,000 present

holders and their 300,000 vehicles. Such a gesture would at least provide competition limited in nature but sufficiently adequate to become a barometer of efficiency to test the operating qualities of the State monopoly.

I turn now to the terms and conditions of compensation in the Bill against which the second of the main objections has been raised. In satisfaction for existing rail and canal stock the Commission propose to issue British Transport two and a half per cent. stock based upon the market valuation operating within certain dates. The principal and interest of the stock will be guaranteed by the Government. The market price chosen is that existing either six months before the last General Election or six days before the King's Speech opening the present session of Parliament (in which the intention to nationalize transport was announced), whichever is the higher.

For the road hauliers a two part scheme of compensation is suggested: the replacement of the acquired assets at the time of the transfer, less depreciation on an agreed scale, and a payment based on from two to five times the net annual profit lost to the undertakings.

For local authorities operating passenger transport services to be acquired under the Bill it is provided that the Commission assumes liability for the interest and sinking fund charges for any net debt which is outstanding at the time of transfer. No further payment is envisaged and this method of compensation is justified by the Government on the ground that the assets are merely being transferred from one public authority to another.

Considerable criticism has been directed against the whole idea of using the prevailing market prices as a basis for compensation. The alternative suggested by the opposition is that the matter be submitted to an independent tribunal for arbitration, the resulting valuation then being accepted by the Government as a basis for compensation. This is not quite so easy as it sounds because of the wide diversity of assets owned by the railway companies. It would certainly require the services of a considerable number of technical and professional experts for a considerable time. But while that fact would not of itself invalidate the method it is relevant to inquire how it is proposed to assess the present earning capacity of the railways. It would be almost impossible adequately to compute the value of, say, a branch line with all its ancillary equipment without reference to the amount and type of traffic likely to pass during a given period. And this piece of vital information is at the moment a very open question. At least this can be maintained: the existing stockholders will suffer no loss of capital and the market price is in many instances substantially higher than before the war owing to the guaranteed revenue paid by the Government during the war years. Two examples can be cited to support this statement: the Great Western Railway ordinary stock which stands at the moment in the market at £59-60 could be purchased in January 1939 for £28, while the London, Midland and Scottish Railway ordinaries' present day value is £29-30 which in 1939 stood at £13-14.

The other aspect of the proposed method of compensation is the loss of income entailed. It is estimated that this income will fall from £40,000,000 to £22,750,000 per annum. It has never been seriously questioned that the State has not the right to benefit from the use of its own credit, or that the drop in income is inevitable when once the principle is accepted that this new stock carries a Government guarantee and therefore is secure against any default. And sufficient attention has not I think been given to the fact that the present rate of income enjoyed by railway stock holders has only been possible by the inflated traffic of the war years.

This volume of traffic clearly could not continue. Indeed, already a substantial fall has occurred and it is a matter of considerable doubt even if more severe restrictions were placed on road transport in favour of the railways whether the latter could earn anything approaching the present guaranteed revenue. The obvious remedy for holders of the new stock who dislike the reduction in their income is to sell and invest in another type of security which, while providing a higher yield, carries a greater amount of risk. The re-investment problem of the holders of debenture stock, which ranks as trustee securities, is not quite so simple. For them, however, the Chancellor of the Exchequer states that he is prepared to consider some increase in the range of trustee stocks. This would go a long way towards removing what might be considered a legitimate grievance in these compensation proposals.

Two final points in connection with this section of the Bill deserve attention. Much criticism has been directed against the suggested terms for acquiring the goodwill of the road haulage undertakings and charges of robbery and parsimony have been levelled against the Government. The prevailing commercial practice when dealing with goodwill in the sale of a concern operating under an A licence is to assess it at a figure varying between £45 and £55 per ton of unladen weight. Judged by this figure the proposals of the Bill err if anything on the generous side.

Secondly, in acquiring municipal passenger undertakings the Commission while taking over their debts will also acquire the benefit of any existing redemption funds. But no provision appears to be made for any extra compensation to the particularly remunerative undertakings. Many local authorities, owing to prudent management over a period of years, have redeemed the whole of the outstanding debt on their passenger carrying fleet and at the same time out of income have brought their assets up to first-class condition. The subsequent profits have then been available for lower fares and the relief of the general rates. The Glasgow Corporation have an excellent record in this respect and, in company with many similarly-placed local authorities, deserve more generous financial treatment than the Bill proposes.

To provide funds for capital purposes for the future development of its assets the Commission is empowered under the terms of the Bill to create and issue additional transport stock amounting to £250,000,000 and to raise tem-

orary loans not exceeding £25,000,000. Judged by any criterion these figures appear inadequate. For example, to electrify the remaining suburban services of the London area now operated by steam traction would, it has been estimated, cost £300,000,000. And it is doubtful if a similar amount would be sufficient to effect the modernization of our existing railway equipment. It is hoped these facts will not be lost sight of when the Committee stage of the Bill is reached and that amendments will be accepted to enable the Commission to deal with the arrears of development in our transport systems.

When commending this measure to the House of Commons on December 8, 1946, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport concluded his speech with these words:

The Bill frees our vital transport industry from the sordid wrangles that have bedevilled it in the past, and creates a sound structure, on which a healthy and progressive transport system can be built, the pride of all who work on it and a vital instrument in planning the reconstruction of our country on new and better foundations.

This belief in the benefits and efficacy of nationalization by the Labour Party is no new thing. For the last half century they have held with all the tenacity of a religious faith a conviction that the major public services and large concentrations of economic power should not be left in private hands. To expect them now to recant this belief when, for the first time in their history, they have the power to translate it into legislation, is as reasonable as to expect the College of Cardinals to repudiate the infallibility of the Pope.

Whether the hopes of the Parliamentary Secretary are realized will depend not only on the quality of those appointed to executive positions but also on the attitude of the rank and file toward their new employers. For many years sections of our industrial community have been very vocal about the iniquity of private profit as the motive force in industry, and have denied vehemently the argument of their opponents that it is vital for the successful operation of any undertaking. This Bill provides the transport worker with the opportunity of proving, at least in part, the truth of this contention. Has the evolution of our social consciousness reached the stage where it can be assumed that service to the community will of itself be regarded as of major importance? I must confess to some doubt in the matter; nevertheless, the passage of this Bill into a smoothly-working Act will depend very largely on how far that ideal is accepted.

(The author is an Associate Member of the Institute of Transport employed in the traffic department of a large industrial concern.)

COMPANY LAW REFORM

BY ALFRED FELLOWS

THE main faults of the English law as to companies were discussed in a previous article in *THE FORTNIGHTLY*,* and stress was laid on two special points: (1) That the list of shareholders filed at Somerset House gave no clue whatever to the fact, when it was a fact, that a private individual had full control of a company, and therefore could use that control to line his own pocket, instead of for the company's benefit, and (2) that the annual audit required by statute gave no protection to the shareholder because the auditors could not value the assets, which could be inflated in value to an almost indefinite upper limit by a dishonest board. An instance given was a balance-sheet issued by the late Whitaker Wright, showing a surplus of £400,000 of assets over liabilities in a wholly insolvent company. The abuse of proxies by directors (largely due to unthinking shareholders returning them signed as a matter of routine) was also considered.

Since that article was published, the report of the Committee on Company Law Amendment, presided over by Lord Justice Cohen, has been published, and a substantial Bill of over a hundred sections and seven schedules has been presented to the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor, mainly to carry out the Committee's recommendations. The task remains therefore to discuss how far the Bill will successfully prevent fraud among company promoters and directors and others—and if fraud on shareholders and persons who deal with a company is made considerably more difficult the law will have achieved a real step to the better.

The Bill rests on the foundation of the last Act consolidating company law, passed in 1929. A new Consolidation Act is adumbrated to incorporate the reforms contained in the Bill, but that will be a matter for the future. A very usual procedure is for Parliament to pass an amending Act and soon after a consolidating Act, incorporating the reforms and repealing the previous Consolidation Act and all previous amending Acts. This is likely to be a very long statute, but the plea is made that it is mere routine, not altering the law, but placing it on a more convenient and tidier footing. Thus opposition is usually prevented, although in practice it is found that consolidation usually involves minor amendments.

The defects in the law which were considered in the previous article were of course notorious, and naturally the Cohen Committee also gave the two mos

* *The Reform of Company Law*, October 1943.

important of them their full attention. Their recommendations are embodied in the Bill before Parliament. In it, there are new and very elaborate provisions as to the annual balance sheets, profit and loss accounts and audit, and the matter of nominee shareholders masking the operations of persons whose objects are to line their own pockets at the expense of shareholders is also met. The provisions to the latter end are wholly new, for those of the previous law merely protected companies from all notice or liability in respect of trusts of shares.

One of the most troublesome factors in both respects was the fact that one limited company is at full liberty to hold shares in another—a great convenience for companies doing linked business, and a *sine qua non* for those (as a modern development) framed to hold the stocks and shares of other companies (usually known as investment companies) thus more or less stabilizing dividends, a loss on the profits of Company A being offset by gains on the trading of Company B, and *vice versa*. Originally there was no specific legislation to regulate the relations of the company holding the shares of another company, but the jugglery of swindlers like Jabez Balfour and Whitaker Wright, placing face value on worthless shares as assets, etc., and contracts with insolvent companies as realities instead of mere paper fantasies, compelled the Legislature to act, and the relations of holding companies and subsidiary companies were regulated. The subsidiary companies were those which by the exercise of their votes through their appropriate nominee or nominees could dominate the holding company, and the subsidiary company in turn might have its own subsidiaries—leading up, it may be, in the centre of the web, to the dishonest man manipulating the shares of the companies concerned for his own profit, and, like Whitaker Wright, issuing fraudulent balance sheets about as dependable as a worm-eaten piece of wood, ready to crumble into powder directly it is touched. In the new Bill there are two or three pages of a schedule dealing with the accounts and audit of holding and subsidiary companies. The purpose of these clauses is to give shareholders in the holding companies a true view of the position and stability of the subsidiary companies, and the very complicated provisions to this end may no doubt be necessary, but will certainly give accountants and auditors in the case of linked companies considerable trouble. Banking companies are exempt from some of the stricter provisions of this schedule, and the Board of Trade apparently has power to treat an investment company as a banking company.

A new provision is that auditors must report on the profit and loss accounts (such accounts being compulsory of course under the previous legislation) and the consolidated accounts of a holding company and its subsidiaries. The paper profit of a company might largely consist of future payments under contracts with various persons or other companies for goods or services supplied, but if the debtors were bankrupt or insolvent, such apparent profits would in reality be losses, for the company's supply would merely be bounty to the

defaulters. If a profit and loss account were dished up by directors on such footing, the auditors' duty would be to point out that profit was not made until the other party had paid up under such a contract. Auditors could not of course be responsible for the solvency of a company's customers or clients.

Unfortunately the average shareholder has a rooted objection to taking any trouble about a company in which he holds shares, and the more elaborate the accounts the less likely he is to attempt to master them, even if he has brains enough to make that attempt successful. The suggestion may be made that the auditors should make a short separate statement on a detached or detachable slip of paper giving their own views on the position of the company whose accounts they have audited. Thus: "Your company appears from the figures which have been before us to have incurred considerable losses in trading for several years, and certain fixed and current assets have also been lost. If we think this represents a precarious position, your directors may have reasons for continuing the operations of your company, and it will be for them to state such reasons, and for you to consider whether the course they advocate is in your best interests." Even the laziest shareholders might take notice of this. Possibly they would not follow it up by attending a general meeting, but it might prevent them automatically sending proxies to the directors, and, if they were fortunate enough to have a fellow shareholder with a mind and ability to challenge the board, the directors could not then smother him with proxies on his challenge. A few shareholders may read the City columns of newspapers, and a company with a footnote of that kind might have a rough passage among the critics.

It has been held, and no doubt rightly, that if shareholders challenge a board right up to litigation, and the board's policy is upheld in the Court, their costs in defending it should be paid by the company. This has placed the challenger in a bad position for in such case they have had to pay their own costs, even if their challenge has been reasonable. The Bill now provides for the circulation of proposed resolutions at general meetings to the shareholders entitled to be present, and the members are entitled to resolve that this shall be done at the company's expense. A shareholder who wishes to make adverse criticism of the directors' policy will thus be placed in a more favourable position if the provision stands.

By the present law an auditor is not obliged to have professional qualifications as an accountant, but the Bill provides that such qualification shall be essential. Probably no company of any importance appoints other than professional accountants as auditors. Directors of a company are now disqualified from being its auditors, and the disqualification is by the Bill very properly extended to the directors of subsidiary companies.

The present law allows of shareholder A holding a share in trust for B—a trust the Courts will enforce notwithstanding that, so far as the company is concerned, the law forbids it to take any notice of trusts. This has enabled

the fraudulent company promoter or manipulators to keep control of a company by his nominees. Thus a register of shareholders is entirely useless for its main purpose, which is that the public and shareholders who consult it may know who really owns shares. The Bill now provides for a new register 'The Register of Share Ownership' with an elaborate definition of owner to ensure that the person so nominated is in fact the beneficial owner and can control the vote and require the transfer of a share against which his name appears as owner in the new register without dictation from anyone else. At first sight it would seem that a single register would be simpler, giving the name of the nominee in one column and the owner in another. The reason why owners of shares do not wish their names to appear as shareholders in a company are not of course necessarily fraudulent, but so much fraud has been practised in this way that such concealment is not considered as further desirable. The trustees of wills and settlements hold large batches of shares, principally in reputable companies, but of course trustees of wills must take any their testator leaves. Some complications may be suggested where shares are vested in trustees, with a provision that a tenant for life can direct votes at general meetings and require change in investments. One holding such an interest might vote or direct a vote so as to provide as much dividend for himself as he could, and oppose any carry-over to reserve. Such misuse of his powers, however, could be prevented by Chancery proceedings in the matter of the trusts of the will or settlement in which the company would take no part. Notwithstanding the care and elaboration of these provisions as to nominees and real owners of shares, some doubt of their effectiveness still exists.

Default in complying with the provisions as to registration of share ownership by any person is made heavily punishable to a maximum of six months imprisonment plus a fine of £500. It may be suggested that if such a default was found to be deliberate on the part of an owner who did not wish this ownership to be disclosed, a judge might be given power to declare a forfeiture of the share or shares in question to the Exchequer. He would not of course do so with shares burdened with a lien for uncalled capital or debts to the company where such shares had a minus value.

The Bill does not apparently deal with a case of hardship mentioned in the previous article, namely that on a reconstruction of a company, involving a variation of the rights of classes of shareholders *inter se*, those who owned, for example, preference but not other shares might be outvoted at the meeting of preference shareholders called to assent to the new arrangement by others holding preference shares but a greater value of ordinary shares. Such persons in their own interests would probably vote for an arrangement benefiting ordinary shareholders at the expense of preference. In a particular case and taking the stock exchange quotation as values, preference shareholders actually lost more of the values of their shares than the ordinary shareholders, though 'preference' was supposed to mean that their rights would be preferred to

those of the ordinary shareholders. Shareholders whose interests are adverse to the holders of other shares of the same class should not be qualified to vote at such a meeting.

The purist in language will probably see much to grieve him in the statute book, so possibly he must bear with the expression 'equity shareholders' meaning those who take the profits after fixed or prior charges have been paid. Freeholders who mortgaged their lands in the usual manner by conveying the legal estate formally lost their rights in the Court of Law, but Chancery Judges gave them an equity to redeem. To call ordinary shares equities is an Americanism. Residuary legatees might as appropriately be called equity legatees.

The abuse of proxies by directors at general meetings to smother opposition was considered in the Committee's report (par. 132) but it is impossible to prevent unthinking shareholders from signing and returning proxies not stamped and perhaps in prepaid envelopes kindly supplied. Shareholders may appoint their directors and, generally speaking, their wisest course is to back up their directors' policy, but it should be remembered that the main reason for requiring an annual general meeting is to consider that policy, and a resolution given to directors before a general meeting is in effect to prejudge it in their favour. The Stock Exchange is said to recommend a "two-way" proxy which presumably means one which allows the shareholder to direct a vote adverse to the Board. It seems to be assumed, and it probably would be held, that directors receiving a proxy adverse to themselves would have a duty to use it against themselves. A novelty which may be convenient allows a shareholder to appoint a non-member of his company as his proxy, for many people buy shares in companies without knowing other shareholders. It might be a useful move to require trustees of wills and settlements, who practically never take the trouble to go to general meetings of companies in which they hold shares on trust, to appoint a beneficiary as proxy, but such a provision would have to be carefully guarded and would more fittingly be placed in a Trusts Act. The Bill makes provision for the possibility of a proxy appointed by two separate persons being required by one to vote for a particular resolution and by the other against it. This is effected by a slight verbal alteration of the original Act.

In some recent cases judges have commented on the inadequate time given to a dissentient shareholder to appeal to a Court against a resolution which he deems unfairly passed. In such case the statutory time for appealing is considerably prolonged by the Bill.

In the previous article the position was discussed of directors of successful companies honestly desiring to accumulate reserves which they do not wish to reveal to their shareholders, which in a public company may include spies and trade rivals. The suggestion was made that a judge should be empowered to allow such a course. In the Bill the Board of Trade may apparently give the required sanction. As the Committee pointed out, knowledge of such reserves

gives directors special advantages in estimating the true value of shares, and the Board would no doubt have to be satisfied that the directors in a case to which they gave their sanction were not going to use this special knowledge to deal in shares to their own advantage.

The converse case of inflation of assets has been a feature of nearly all the company swindles on the large scale in the last hundred years. In certain instances the true valuation of assets may give rise to very great difficulties. Goodwill, for example, might remain at an unchanged figure in the balance sheet of a company, the profit and loss accounts on trading of which might show a continuous and increasing loss for years. Since auditors will have to certify to profit and loss accounts if the Bill is passed, would it be their duty to call attention to such an apparent discrepancy, so that, if they failed to do so, a Court would impute negligence to them? A company formed to own and work a mine, floated on the sanguine report of an expert, might spend much money over a long period in exploration without result. Would it be the duty of an auditor to call attention to such a point, and insist that the mine as asset should be devalued? In each such case, of course, the directors might have a good answer to a criticism of this kind. In a case in the Court of Appeal towards the end of the last century, on which comment was made in the previous article, it would almost appear that the duty of auditors was confined to addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Possibly the tightening up of the duties of auditors by subsequent legislation would enable a Court to rule that that unsatisfactory decision may now be distinguished or disregarded.

Comment was made in the debate on the second reading of the Bill in the House of Lords that there was nothing in the way of reform applicable to the law concerning a Company's Memorandum of Association, a document setting forth the company's objects and powers. The Articles of Association concern a company's internal administration, and can be altered by the shareholders after certain formalities, but the Memorandum can only be altered by the leave of a judge. Naturally directors do not wish to go to the expense and trouble of an appeal to a Court if they can help it, and, if original directors, shareholders might wish to know why they had lacked the foresight to include a wanted power. To prevent such a possibility Memoranda have for years been drafted with the most extensive powers, with headings exhausting the letters of the alphabet, and a final "omnibus" clause "objects conducing to the above objects," etc. In a modern Memorandum the difficulty would be to pick out something which the company could not do. The late Lord Russell of Killowen made a scathing comment on this state of affairs in his speech in the House of Lords on a case before him, and the critic in the above debate suggested that the drafting of the Memorandum of a company merely gave work for lawyers, and it would be better to let a company start with all powers (as Chartered Companies do, though of course a Charter may curtail objects) and as an individual does when he starts a business. Possibly this might be considered

in Committee. Incidentally, the previous requirement that a prospectus should set forth the Memorandum is dropped in the Bill, as also the names and addresses of the signatories to it, and the number of original shares taken by each. In the ordinary case this has been a stereotyped list of persons of particular distinction taking one share each. This information is practically valueless, and is now so treated. On the other hand, the disclosures required to appear in a prospectus are considerably tightened up. The "wild-cat" promoter has of course had his activities wholly curbed in the last few years by the Treasury control of company issues, but the Bill rightly anticipates that he will resume business at the earliest possible opportunity, if the law fails to cramp him.

The present Acts dictate no age limit for directors. The Bill provides that they shall automatically retire at the age of seventy, with a saving that shareholders may by special resolution keep a septuagenarian in office. Such a provision seems fairly reasonable, though one critic did point out that, if two directors attained that age in the same year, to keep one and reject the other might seem somewhat invidious. In a search for the most brilliant mind in the realm that of a particular man over seventy might well be chosen and the names of the first Lord Halsbury, Mr. Gladstone, and the great Duke of Wellington (not to mention Queen Victoria) come readily to mind.

Of course no legislation can entirely protect shareholders who never attend to their affairs, nor can the case of dishonest auditors in league with dishonest directors be prevented before they have ruined their shareholders, though there is now ample provision for sending both sets of rogues to penal servitude when their swindles have been discovered. The requirement that auditors must be qualified men may be a wise precaution, for their status would be at stake. Likewise, as Lord Maugham pointed out in debate, this practice of dishonest directors using their special information acquired in the course of a company's business to sell shares if they know their company is doing badly before the public and other shareholders have that knowledge or, conversely, buying shares if their company is prospering, the share price in each case being fixed by people having no access to such special knowledge, should be checked by provisions in the Bill.

A vast proportion of the country's trade is conducted by limited companies and that they should be clean inside and out is a necessity if we are to keep our reputation for honest dealing. The Bill goes a long way to ensure this object and when it has passed through the Committee stages should be a very useful piece of legislation. The great majority of limited companies are of course conducted honestly and straightforwardly and Acts directed against the crooks who control the small minority no more indicate that a large number of companies are fraudulently conducted than the existence of a law against murder warrants the deduction that a considerable portion of our populace is addicted to killing with malice aforethought.

ALDOUS HUXLEY AND THE MYSTICS

BY NORMAN NICHOLSON

[N a writer of real integrity what matters is usually not so much the value of this or that of his works, nor even the combined value of them all, but the graph of his development. In some cases this graph is broken and erratic: in others it is a smooth curve, and this is particularly so where the writer has not dissipated his talents, has not written to order or to fashion. Such a writer is Aldous Huxley, and while no one, certainly not Mr. Huxley himself, could have forecast *Time Must Have a Stop* from *Crome Yellow*, yet, looking back, we can see how natural, and perhaps inevitable, has been his progression.

Mr. Huxley emerged in the 1920's as the most brilliant, and perhaps the most gifted, of the group of young men directly influenced by D. H. Lawrence. He had nothing of Lawrence's intensity, nor his understanding of nature and the physical world, but he had a genuine gaiety and zest for life. That life, however, though gay and even glittering, was curiously cold. Mr. Huxley could enjoy conversation, wit, music, art, but he had no love whatever for his fellow beings, so that his cynicism, which at first (like Lawrence's ribaldry and humour in *Nettles* and elsewhere) had seemed the result of his intolerance with institutions, soon seemed to be directed, even rather maliciously, at man as a creature.

In this satire there began to sound a note of disgust, especially with regard to the physical. Gumbriel, in *Antic Hay*, striding about the streets in his false beard, picking up women, frightening financiers, had been only an impersonation of Lawrence's natural man, but at least he got some enjoyment out of his impersonation. In *Those Barren Leaves* and *Point Counter Point* there is no joy left in enjoyment. Mr. Quarles (senior) engages a secretary to be his mistress, but sees that she does some typing also; a middle-aged rake plans to marry a congenital idiot for her money, but she dies from food-poisoning on the eve of the wedding. The characters of these novels are mostly bored, heartless and aimless—variations on a few types. Later, this horror of the physical becomes even more pronounced, till, in *Eyeless in Gaza*, a girl is sick when she touches a kidney in a butcher's shop, and two lovers, sunbathing on a roof, are splashed with the blood of a dog which falls from an aeroplane.

Moreover, this disgust with the physical showed itself in another form. He was attracted and moved by art, yet he found it almost incredible that art should need to express itself through material means. Scattered about his

writing we find various virtuoso passages in which art and thought are plained on the level of biology, chemistry, or physics. Bach's B minor Suite for flute and strings, for instance, is thought of in terms of vibrating columns of air and of the nose of the performer ("snout" Mr. Huxley calls it); and "the hand that wrote, the brain that conceived the slow movement of the Jupiter Symphony" is remembered the "sheep's hind leg and leaves of spinach" which they once were, and the grass and dandelions into which they would proceed after Mozart was buried. Now in these passages, which show his style at its best, Mr. Huxley makes it clear that he sees this interdependence of the physical and the spiritual as, at least, very odd. One is tempted, indeed, to suspect that he even feels that, in a vague and indefensible way, the spinach and the dandelions debase the music. To anyone who has honestly acknowledged the human predicament in a temporal and material world it seems instead that the music is a triumphant transfiguration of the spinach and the grass, if, indeed, spinach and grass, and even sheep and noses, are not just as perfect in their own way as the Jupiter.

While in these earlier books Mr. Huxley remained remote from society and even from man, he did not repudiate that society. In *Brave New World*, however, he wrote a bitter satire on the whole trend of western civilization, especially on its politics and technology. Modern politics lead directly to war, and "technological progress has merely provided us with more efficient means of going backward." Politics were, quite literally, the sphere of the devil. In *Grey Eminence* Mr. Huxley made a study of Père Joseph, the right-hand man of Cardinal Richelieu. Père Joseph was a man of great and genuine piety who rose every day at four and spent the first two hours in mental prayer. Yet he was probably the most hated man in Europe, who organized an immense spy system and descended to every trick and deception to prolong the Thirty Years War, one of the most fearful wars in history. Mr. Huxley believes that Père Joseph, the mystic, would never have condoned such methods had he not been defiled by the touch of politics.

For a while it seemed that Mr. Huxley was entirely hopeless in the face of civilization as he saw it, but in *Ends and Means* we get the first exposition of his new philosophy, and in *Eyeless in Gaza* and *Time Must Have a Stop* we get accounts of the process of conversion to it.

Briefly, it is a philosophy of "non-attachment":

The ideal man is the non-attached man. Non-attached to his bodily sensations and lusts. Non-attached to his craving for power and possessions. Non-attached to the objects of these various desires. Non-attached to his anger and hatred; non-attached to his exclusive loves. Non-attached to wealth, fame, social position. Non-attached even to science, art, speculation, philanthropy.

In *Ends and Means* this philosophy of non-attachment was applied largely to politics, leading Mr. Huxley to advocate pacificism, de-centralization of power, and a completely new attitude to the modern belief in progress.

rough material advance. In his latest book *The Perennial Philosophy*,* he ranges wider over human experience, and tries to present what he calls the highest Common Factor in all the philosophies and religions of the world. In his H.C.F. he summarizes thus:

The metaphysic that recognizes a divine Reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, divine Reality; the ethic that places man's final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent Ground of all being.

He presents it in an anthology of quotations, and argues that the best way to learn how to achieve knowledge of the divine ground is by studying the lives and teaching of those who themselves have gone far towards achieving it—and these, he believes, are not the philosophers or theologians, but the mystics.

He compares the mystical knowledge of the divine ground with astronomy: the nice, ordinary, unregenerate" person sees with the naked eye only a smudge where the astronomer sees "the galactic and extra-galactic nebulae." This is in a way true, but it is less impressive if you think of God not as an infinitely remote star, but as the sun, in and by whose heat and light we live and move. For whatever the astronomers may tell us about the sun, it is the personal experience of its light and heat which will mean most to each of us, and the sun, moreover, shines equally on "ordinary, nice people" and on those who are extraordinary and evidently not nice. We must speak of God in metaphors, but I find Mr. Huxley's metaphor of the divine ground curiously unsatisfactory, suggesting as it does a learned musician listening to complicated counterpoint.

Nevertheless, while I believe in the sun because I feel it hot on my face, I am ready to recognize that astronomy can tell me much that I could not find out for myself. I am ready, therefore, to listen to Mr. Huxley's exposition of the negative way mainly through the means of quotation. No doubt the subject has been covered more thoroughly by scholars and students but it can rarely have been made so accessible to the general reader. Many of the quotations shine out with moving clarity and simplicity:

The Inner Light is beyond praise and blame;
Like space it knows no boundaries,
Yet it is even here, within us, ever retaining its serenity and fulness.
It is only when you hunt for it that you lose it;
You cannot take hold of it, but equally you cannot get rid of it,
And while you can do neither, it goes on its own way.

That was from Yung-chia Ta-shih, who (if I have managed to track the meaning through Mr. Huxley's paragraphs) belongs to Mahayana Buddhism. And against this let me put a Christian mystic, Dionysius the Areopagite:

The simple, absolute and immutable mysteries of divine Truth are hidden in the super-luminous darkness of that silence which revealeth in secret. For this darkness, though of profound obscurity, is yet radiantly clear; and, though beyond touch and

* Chatto and Windus, 2s. 6d.

sight, it more than fills our unseeing minds with splendours of transcendent beauty For this is truly to see and to know and, through the abandonment of all things, to praise Him who is beyond and above all things. For this is not unlike the art of those who carve a life-like image from stone: removing from around it all that impedes clear vision of the latent form, revealing its hidden beauty solely by taking away.

This then is the negative way, but Mr. Huxley realizes that it is not the only way. There is also the affirmative way, the way of the acceptance of images, the sacramental way. Mr. Huxley acknowledges that it is the denial of this way which has led to the exploitation and destruction of natural resources, to the "organized lovelessness" of our present-day society. But we do not feel that his acknowledgment of this other approach to reality goes very deep. We can imagine his saying, as he himself once reported Lawrence to have said of something else: "I do not believe it *here*"—placing his hands on his solar plexus.

And this to my mind is the main weakness not so much of this book as of Mr. Huxley's outlook in general—the negative way is not to him a sacrifice, a self-denial, it is rather the indulgence of his disgust with the flesh and the material world. The great Christian ascetics did not hate the world; they loved it—hence their repudiation of it meant something to them. For Mr. Huxley, non-attachment is a comparatively easy business. What he needs is to be genuinely and unselfishly *attached* to something, and to advance in charity towards the "nice, ordinary unregenerate people" for whom, he thinks, the sacraments of Christianity can do little good. I was travelling in a railway carriage with some workmen when one of them snored. His mate looked up and said: "To think that Jesus Christ died for him!" The man was no doubt intending to be blasphemous, but he knew more of Christianity than does Mr. Huxley.

For in arriving at his position of modern gnosticism, he has taken up the Manichean heresy, so attractive and dangerous to some minds, that the material world is of itself evil and that salvation is possible only by escape from it. Commenting on the biblical myth of the creation and the fall, he says: "That creation, the incomprehensible passage from the unmanifested One into the manifest multiplicity of nature, from eternity into time, is not merely the prelude and necessary condition of the Fall; to some extent it *is* the Fall." Now Christians do not close their eyes to the problems of evil and suffering in nature, and some are beginning to think of a cosmic or pre-mundane fall in which the natural world as well as man may have been involved, but this is very far from regarding nature and matter and time as evil in themselves. Mr. Huxley's point of view inevitably makes him suspicious and at times derisive of all manifestations of the divine and eternal in the temporal, from miracles and the sacraments to incarnation. He is particularly suspicious of the historical dogma of Christianity, because it refers to a particular time and one particular place. He can conceive of sacramental g . . . sort of

religious auto-suggestion. Indeed, he sees one-way traffic between man and God, all God-wards. His God is as helpless as an angler without rod and line who can only catch a fish if it comes out of the water and gives itself up.

The Perennial Philosophy, then, is an elaborate manual of instruction for the fish who want to give themselves up, and while we may feel that it is sucking in charity to the fish who want to stay in the sea (many of whom will not be caught—thank the divine ground!), it is still an unusually interesting book. The greater amount of the quotations are drawn from the East, and of those from the West, very few come from the Bible. Mr. Huxley explains this by saying that "familiarity with traditionally hallowed writings tends to breed, not indeed contempt, but something which, for practical purposes, is almost as bad—namely a kind of reverential insensibility, a stupor of the spirit, an inward deafness to the meaning of the sacred words." This is true, but the difficulty can be overcome, at least in part, by using a different translation. Moreover, I think the reader would have appreciated the less familiar quotations still more if he had been able to see them by the side of familiar ones. As it is, the selections from William Law, Traherne and a few others, excellent as they are in themselves, give an almost grotesquely limited view of the mysticism of the West.

LANGURS

BY R. N. CURREY

SPENDING the day up here wired in by rain
I watch this fragment of a folk-migration,
A tiny tribe perhaps of the great nation
That roamed the country with green Hanuman
For centuries before earth-footed man
With his pedestrian conglomeration
Of bows and cooking-pots; in their own fashion
These langurs cross a landscape spiked with rain.

They have no sort of shelter from the rain;
It drives through the soft foliage of the trees
Down their black glistening trunks; from one of these
They drop down gracefully upon the grass,
Squat black-glancing round, and softly pass
With half-a-dozen bounds in twos and threes
To an assembly-point between two trees,
And gravely sit and contemplate the rain.

They seem in their close discipline in the rain
A portion rather of some regiment
Of the great force the Monkey God once sent
(In those far ages when the Apes and Bears
Were Infantry and Indian Engineers!)
To bridge the narrow waters to Ceylon
And hurl the demon-head Ravanna down
Beneath the silver arrows of the rain;

A portion of the force that braved the rain
Before stone temples forced above the trees
Their crowns of writhing many-limbed deities:
Langurs and chimpanzees and huge baboons
Swinging across the creeper-hung lagoons,
Mandrill and gibbon, ape and marmoset—
Some with the fighting colours that even yet
Shine out like firefly tails through monsoon rain.

They face in one direction through the rain,
Fawn-overcoated figures with black faces,
With cowls and monkish mows and quick grimaces
And circular scratchings; this stout veteran
Without a tail looks round him like a man :
He wrings his black gloved hands quite humanly,
Scatters a shower of spray, then suddenly
Sets out with easy bounds into the rain.

They move across the open through the rain
Like race-horses in prints, but *chest-à-terre*;
Wasp-waisted, with a black-faced teddy bear
At each camp-follower's breast; here on the ground
Their tails are strong black snakes curled out behind;
Now that they bound and swing among new trees
Their tails are ropes, their fawn agilities
Viewed through the vertical cage-bars of the rain.

MANUEL DE FALLA'S MUSIC

BY WALTER STARKIE

UNIVERSAL grief will be felt throughout the Spanish world at the news of the death of Manuel de Falla in Argentina. Some time ago many rumours had reached Madrid concerning the master's state of health: some even were reassuring and stated that he wished to end his life in a monastery. Spanish music has indeed cause to mourn the death of Falla for he had been more to his country than the foremost composer in the nationalist sense; he had become universal, and such works as *El Amor Brujo* and *Noches en los Jardines de España* were part of the world's heritage of music. Falla had been, not only an inspired composer, but also a pioneer pointing the way to the future, and he had throughout his life done for Spain what Vaughan Williams has done for England, Ravel for France and Bartok for Hungary.

The last time I met Manuel de Falla was the year before the Spanish Civil War in Granada. Owing to his delicate state of health he had been living, even then, the life of a recluse and rarely left his house, except on Sundays when the decrepit cab would drive up to take him to Mass. For one as deeply absorbed in his dreams as the *maestro* there was no need to wander far from the little house for it stands on a slope behind the Alhambra and from its little garden one could gaze down upon the vast flowering *vega* of Granada, celebrated by Moorish poets as comparable to the plain of Damascus. In former years Falla had lived in one of the little "carmenes" in the Alhambra and it was there that I had met him for the first time in 1921. Under the trees we had listened to a Cuadro flamenco and the guitarist, Angel Barrios, had played Spanish music. Then in his studio Don Manuel had performed for us works of Debussy, and Ravel that evoked Spain, and he had played for us his own *Nights in the Gardens of Spain*, one of the most significant works he ever composed, for it concentrates within its harmony the essence of the Andalusian spirit, one of the oldest in the world. Later the composer led us out into the moonlight towards the Generalife or Garden of the Tone-architect, as the Moors called it. It was a moonlit night and the avenues of cypress trees leading up to the Garden were like ghostly sentinels around a fantastic palace of the Arabian Nights. We entered a paradise of myrtle, boxwood and laurel, and our senses were lulled by the sound of countless laughing, bubbling cascades. Above our heads the nightingales were trilling and fluting in full-throated minstrelsy.

I have never forgotten that evening which introduced me to Manuel de

Falla's music and on many subsequent visits to Granada I tried to recapture, in vain, that spirit. Falla, like Ganivet, possessed the eternal melancholy of the Andalusian; a strange and complex consciousness of his racial destiny, which we find in all Andalusians whether great or humble. It is this which gives a subtle, cosmic quality to his work, and he too possessed what Goethe called "a sense of the past and present as being one; a conception which infuses a spectral element into the present." After many years of wandering through Spain and during which I had the opportunity of hearing the folk-singers and players, I feel as if Falla had transmuted into his music the concentrated essence of his country's spirit. His music, by its intensity and concentration always reminds me of one of the flowering patios of the Generalife, a tiny nook of shade in which the Moors had created a paradise in miniature with bubbling waters, fragrant flowers and tropical leaves, half-riding the brick steps and graceful fountain paved with coloured tiles. Critics have noticed how his music, especially his later work has a touch of the glittering concision of the Neapolitan composer Domenico Scarlatti, but it is rooted in profound Andalusian race consciousness. In addition we should not forget the modern element in his work and his struggle to achieve expression in the universal language of music in the same way as Ravel and Bartok did in their countries. To understand this point let us consider his life.

Falla was born at Cadiz in 1876 and he received his early music lessons from his mother who was an accomplished pianist. From an early age he was surrounded by music, for Cadiz ever since the eighteenth century when it was one of the most prosperous cities in Europe, was visited regularly by Italian opera companies, and people made music in their homes. In Madrid Falla entered definitely upon his true path in music for he became the pupil in composition of Pedrell who was to inspire him to study the wealth of Spanish folk-music. It is significant to remember Pedrell when we talk of Falla and modern Spanish music, for Falla himself later on, when he was called the leader of Spanish composers, refused the title, saying that if ever there was a leader, it was the veteran Felipe Pedrell. In Madrid Falla won a prize for piano playing, and the prize in a national opera-competition organized by the Royal Academy of Fine Arts, with *La Vida Breve*, 1905. This short opera marked his definite entry into fame, but it was not produced until 1914 in Paris. In 1907 he went to Paris where he devoted himself intensely to the study of his art, and his life was one of constant drudgery for a mere subsistence. It is all the more characteristic of his tenacious nature that he should have refused tempting offers from opera companies in Europe to write Spanish operas of the conventional sort, to order. At that very time in Paris another great figure of modern Spanish music, Joaquin Turina, was studying there, and he has related in print how he and Falla met the great Isaac Albeniz, and it was Albeniz who encouraged them with words of enthusiasm and urged them to continue manfully their attempt to create Spanish music, yes,

but music that would also be European. Falla, no less than Albeniz and Turina, was helped with friendly advice by famous composers, such as Debussy, Ravel and Dukas. So successful was the opera *La Vida Breve* at its first production at Nice in 1913 that it was afterwards performed in Paris at the Opéra-Comique in 1914. The public immediately recognized the subtle qualities of this miniature opera which is a worthy pendant to Bizet's *Carmen*. Pedro Morales, musician, poet and *Andaluz viejo* has often proclaimed that Falla's heroine, not Mérimée's, is the Spanish operatic character *par excellence*.

At the outbreak of the war of 1914 Falla had to leave France as he refused to adopt French nationality in order to achieve greater success in Paris. He returned to Spain and established himself at Granada, and it was amid the trees and gardens of the Alhambra and the Generalife that he composed his music. It was Granada that appealed to his philosophical mind, and, as Salvador de Madariaga has said, "a mind formed by Granada is bound to learn serenity from the alleys of cypress trees which make her the favourite haunt of poets." Falla, after his years of struggle in Paris wished to renew his soul and his inspiration and discover new paths. He has often referred to the danger of repeating oneself, of creating from the same mould, and of letting old age drive one inexorably into narrow academic paths. First of all he composed *El Sombrero de Tres Picos* (The Three-cornered Hat) which was produced in its final form in London in 1919. It was interesting to note the evolution that took place in this last work. In its original form it was called *El Corregidor y la Molinera* and was a mime, and a delightful one at that, accompanied by a small orchestra, but when the composer amplified the work for Diaghilev, the latter, with his unerring genius for uniting the arts, made it into one of the most beautiful of the Russian Ballets.

The next epoch-making work of the composer was *El Amor Brujo* (Wedded by Witchcraft) which may be said to have swept the musical world off its feet by its barbaric rhythms and rich tonal colour. In all these works Falla moulded his style upon the folk tunes and dances, and wrote music which though not actual folk song, yet took its sinews from folk song. Few composers could be more fastidious and painstaking than this sensitive and mystic Andalusian. So sensitive was he and so self-critical that he was for ever recasting his works, correcting, polishing, purifying in the passionate attempt to reach the truth. His art is essentially Spanish in that it is impressionistic, but impressionistic in the sense that Ortega y Gasset gives to the word in his great book *Meditaciones del Quijete*, where he refers to the astonishing visual power possessed by Cervantes in his narrative, which made Flaubert cry out as he read *Don Quixote*: "*Comme on voit ces routes d'Espagne qui ne sont nulle part décrites.*" Goethe once said that the organ by which he understood the world was the eye, and dealing with Falla we might paraphrase and say that the organ by which he understood the world was the ear. Falla heard at every pore. Not only the actual melodies and rhythms of modern Spain,

but also those that echo faintly from Spain's musical past.

When we come to the next work of his, *Noches en los Jardines de España* (Nights in the gardens of Spain), there is a further advance in his art, and we remember the motto attributed to him by the Andalusian poet and musician Pedro García Morales: "God, Art, and Country". These words enclose the philosophical synthesis of his life, but, continues Morales, "Falla had imposed upon the impulses of his mind a discipline which seems to follow in inverse order this motto." In other words, the discipline was meant to start from the popular (*El Amor Brujo* and *The Three-cornered Hat*) then to attain the aesthetic ideal and rise finally to the metaphysical.

The *Nights in the Gardens of Spain*, which he called "Nocturnes," is in three parts and described by the following sub-titles: "In the Generalife", "Distant Dance" and "In the Gardens of the Sierra of Cordoba". As in his former works, the composer builds his thematic material on rhythms, modes, cadences and forms, inspired by Andalusian folk song, but never once does he borrow an actual Andalusian folk melody. This work which was finished in 1916 was played in London in 1921 with the composer at the piano. To find a parallel in literature to this enchanting music which evokes the spirit of Andalusia, we must turn to the subtlest magician in verse, the late lamented García Lorca, also an Andalusian, in such a poem as *La Guitarra* where the poet describes the lament of the guitar, with its monotonous weeping as the water weeps, as the wind weeps over the snow fall; we may not hush it for it weeps for things far distant.

Such a work as the "Nocturnes" explains the basic beliefs on music held by the composer. For him Mussorgsky was the true initiator of the new era in music and thanks to his influence and that of his followers the melodic forms and ancient scales that had been despised by composers and had taken refuge in the Church and among the folk were restored to music. Falla believed that the modern spirit in music dwelt mostly in three fundamental elements, rhythm, modality, and melody used as a means to evocation. Hence the immense importance of Debussy in modern music, for he by such works as *L'Après-midi d'un Faune* and *Pelléas et Mélisande* established the technique of modern music. Falla, too, in his theoretical writings laid stress upon the importance of Glinka's famous visit to Andalusia in 1847, when he wandered about the country alone from Madrid to Seville and thence to Granada. It was in the Albaicín and the Sacro Monte and in Granada that he met the gypsy guitarist Francisco Rodríguez Murciano whose improvised accompaniment so moved him that he wrote certain important works using in them flamenco rhythms, blending these gypsy elements with Russian folk song. He originated the Russian style in music which has been developed by Mussorgsky, Rimsky Korsakov and other members of the "Five". As a demonstration of these theories Falla organized a festival of "*Cante Jondo*", the traditional folk-song of South Andalusia, mainly practised by the gypsies.

This festival, which was held at Granada in 1922 has been described by Professor J. B. Trend in his excellent biography on Manuel de Falla, 1929, and Falla himself published, as a result of the festival in 1922, a short study on the essential qualities of the "*Cante Jondo*" or Deep Song, which is the primitive Andalusian singing. This pamphlet is of importance to those who wish to understand the essence of Falla's music. He shows that "Deep Song" has analogy with oriental types of melody and the position of smaller intervals in the scale is not invariable for their production depends upon the raising and lowering of the voice due to the expression given to the word which is being sung. In addition we find *portamento* of the voice—that is to say a method of singing which produces the infinite graduations of pitch existing between two notes whether near to each other or far apart. One of the most striking differences between "Deep Song" and later Western music is that the accompaniments in the former rarely exceed the limit of a sixth, but by the employment of quarter and third tones the singer can increase the number of tones which he can produce. The small compass is one of the reasons why the uninitiated consider such music monotonous, but a Spanish gypsy, hearing western music would remark sadly that it moved up and down too much, and he would prefer his own music which seems to flow continuously like a river of sound. Falla also refers to the repetition in "Deep Song" of the same note to the point of obsession accompanied by an *appoggiatura* from above or below. This method of repetition is oriental and is characteristic of certain forms of enchantment which have been practised by the Romany race. In this way Falla studied the primitive method of singing of Andalusia in all its complexities, and he discovered in that singing elements inherited from the Byzantine liturgy and the music of the Moors of Granada, and the influences of gypsy tribes who arrived in Spain in 1447. Professor Trend in a commemorative broadcast on the composer compared him to one of the early Spanish "conquistadores" setting sail in a tiny caravel to discover new lands. Falla all his life was filled with the desire to discover new territory and he was for ever on a restless quest. There was in his character too a mystic quality. He was a lover of the "starry autos" of Calderon, and the ecstatic poems of that flame-like spirit, St. John of the Cross. The lines of the mystic poet appealed to him:

La noch sosegada
 en par de los levantes de la aurora,
 la música callada,
 la soledad sonora
 la cena, que recrea y enamora.

The hush and peace of night,
 and dawn's first rays of light,
 soft music in echoing solitude
 the Feast of love that builds anew.

This is the Manuel de Falla that I remember from the day when I last saw

him in his house at Granada in the Spring of 1935. I had not seen him for some years and in the interval his face had become more delicate and more ethereal. I remember him as he was in 1921, the creator of the "Ritual with Fire Dance" with its evocation of gypsy magic. He seemed to be an intellectual at grips with a herd of Andalusian demons. Then I remember him on various occasions in the years 1925 to 1931 in Madrid or in Paris. The latest vision of Falla in Spain was created by his great friend the painter Ignacio Suloaga in his portrait wherein the composer resembles a ghost-like figure of El Greco, ashen grey, gaunt and emaciated, against a gloomy, eerie background.

Nevertheless, before Falla retired to the philosophical surroundings of the Alhambra he struggled ceaselessly to create a perfect medium for his inspiration. His puppet-opera, *El Retablo de Maese Pedro* (Master Peter's Puppet Show) based upon the adventures of Don Quixote, was performed in Paris in 1924. This work which is one of the composer's masterpieces deserves analysis. Don Quixote and his squire Sancho Panza are at an inn when a travelling showman arrives with a marionette theatre, and a performance is arranged in the stable of the inn. The play which the puppets perform is taken from an old ballad of Spain, telling of Don Gaiferos and the Princess Melisendra. The showman inside the little theatre pulls the strings for the puppets, and the boy assistant explains the action to the rustic audience. Don Quixote is an old gentleman well versed in chivalry and ballad lore who interrupts from time to time, and finally when the Moors ride out in pursuit of Don Gaiferos and Melisendra he springs up sword in hand, slashes the puppets to bits and destroys the showman's theatre. It is interesting to compare this work which is based upon the immortal book with the ballet *Petrushka* in which Stravinsky evokes the Neapolitan mask Pulcinella. Stravinsky not only evokes the spirit of Pergolesi but the ancient *Commedia dell' Arte* of Italy with its fixed puppet-like characters and this he does by creating brilliantly grotesque effect and rhythms and illuminating all the work with his poetic Russian musical genius.

Falla using themes which derive their sinews from Castilian folk song has with grave humour interpreted the story and the literary style of Cervantes, thereby creating afresh in the universe of music the undying symbol of Spain. Rarely do we find an opera where the composer has so completely absorbed the contents of the literature. The music seems to follow every curve and line of the literary style, but then in a sense the whole story and the style become sublimated in our imagination and we have only ears for the intimate music of Falla. In this music Falla conjures up memories of those ancient days when the ballads were the soul of Spain. The music of this work is Castilian whereas the music of the earlier works was Andalusian. But what is Castile in Spain, but a central plateau held in equilibrium with tensions pulling north, south, east and west? The tensions in the mind of Falla pro-

duced his perfect equilibrium as a musician. In the " Harpsichord Concerto " which was Falla's next work we find a still greater attempt to return to a Spanish classical style, and in this work there is, as it were, an evocation of the music of Domenico Scarlatti, especially in the last movement. We feel that the composer consciously evoked the eighteenth century Neapolitan composer who lived so long in Spain, in order to give a note of fragrance to his work and to make it suggestive as he had done in the " Retablo." But there is an immense abyss between the world of Scarlatti and the world of Falla. Falla, in the concerto, has not changed the style that he possessed when writing the " Nocturnes ", but in his later works he has intensified his art and subjected it to ever greater discipline. Of Falla, as of the Stravinsky of the piano sonata and concerto, it is useless to talk of neo-classicism following the phrase of Verdi: "*torniamo all' antico.*" What has happened is that the composer in his austere self-discipline has tried to reach down to the fundamentals of his art.

When I visited Falla in 1935 he was putting the finishing touches to his work *Atlántida* which is based upon the epic poem of the Catalan poet Jacinto Verdaguer. The story told by the old man to the young Genoese is the story of Atlantis which is the lost country sunk in the sea beyond the west coast of Spain. The Genoese youth then sees the new world rising before him. His name is Christopher Columbus and inspired by the words of the old hermit he sets out in his three ships to discover the new world. The idea of the submerged continent of Atlantis has fascinated poets, musicians and artists for centuries. Some see in the Isles of the Fortunate or the Canaries the remains of the submerged continent; poets in Provence like the great old *felibre*, the Marquis de Baroncelli, see in the nomad gypsy tribes who haunt the crypt of their St. Sara the true descendants of the inhabitants of Atlantis. Such is the subject that fascinated the genius of Falla, and absorbed his later years. But then came the cataclysm of the Civil War in 1936 and Falla departed to America, and it is said that the work has never been completed. It is to be hoped, however, the world may be given an opportunity of hearing it even in its unfinished state, perhaps under the direction of Ernesto Halffter, who of all the disciples of Falla seems to have best understood his message. Is it not significant that Falla, after choosing Andalusian themes and then Castilian should end by choosing Mediterranean? He has, thereby, harmonized three eternal themes of Spain.

One last vision I have of Manuel de Falla. It was in 1931, some months after the declaration of the Republic that I found myself in the village of Zumaya in the Spanish Basque country where Zuloaga used to hold his court and gather his *tertulia*. Zuloaga's house was called " Santiago Echea " which means the House of St. James and this name was given to it because in the demesne is the ancient chapel wherein pilgrims of the Middle Ages, journeying along the Road of St. James to his far-off shrine in Galicia used to

It and rest their weary bodies. In the flowering garden around the ancient in the painter would gather together his literary, artistic and Bohemian ends; painters, musicians, writers, bull-fighters, pelota-players, gypsies—I found welcome in the garden of the genial painter. Seated in a ring round their host I saw Unamuno, Ramón del Valle Inclán, Ramón Perez de Ayala, Belmonte. In the distance an organ sounded: Manuel de Falla was playing in the little chapel. In that group in the rose garden were some of the greatest personalities of modern Spain: Unamuno, rugged as the primeval rock of the Basque races; Valle Inclán, gaunt and drooping, an El Greco picture suddenly come to life; Zuloaga, tall, rugged, athletic like a pelota player; Belmonte, sallow, black-haired, lithe of figure like an Andalusian dancer. Unamuno poured rapid words out in never ending stream, but occasionally the strange metallic voice of Valle Inclán diverted the stream in the opposite direction; then all we heard was the lisping Galician tone rising and falling like the song of a shanachie. Then gently and unobtrusively Manuel de Falla would enter the group bringing with him, as it were, the departed echoes of the chorale he had been playing. The conversation would range excitedly over a wide field of topics but Falla would lie back in his chair with an abstracted air waiting for silence, when he could begin a long, passionate harangue about music. But silence was not to be found in that *tertulia*. We must go back to the moonlit gardens of the musician at Granada, and it is in those enchanted gardens of the Alhambra that his spirit will remain forever as a haunting presence.

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

CASTE IN INDIA

BY SIR WILLIAM P. BARTON

THE driving power behind the political movement in India proceeds from the higher grades of Hindu society, the Brahmin lawyer, the big business man and the Hindu professional classes generally. In other words, it is a high-caste movement. The Hindu politician owes the ascendancy he has achieved, in the government of the country, mainly to the vote of the illiterate peasantry, influenced by the Gandhian mysticism, rather than by ideals of political liberty which convey nothing to them.

These are incontrovertible facts. Pundit Nehru himself would admit them. A strange anomaly in present conditions is the readiness of the British Socialist Government to hand over India to this high-caste group, dominated by the capitalists, provided only the Muslims can be persuaded to accept such a régime. It will of course be argued that the movement, though middle-class, is inspired with the spirit of democracy and that ultimately the masses may assert themselves. But does such a theory take sufficient account of the insidious influence of the caste system in the social, economic, and religious spheres? In Hindu society to-day, one out of four or five of the population is outcast, shunned by the caste Hindu, and economically helpless. Both in the case of the outcast and of the Sudra peasantry who form the majority of the Hindu community, religious superstition offers an opportunity to dominate, of which one can hardly expect the Brahmin not to avail himself. Then how does caste affect the question of defence? Will the peasant and outcast soldier, deprived of their heritage, accept the leadership of the Brahmin and of the professional castes? In his book, *Gandhi and Anarchy*, Sir Sankaran Nair, a well-known Indian politician, expressed the view that the military weakness of India, arising from the caste system, was responsible for the Muslim conquest, and for eight centuries of Muslim domination. He thinks that it was because of the hated inhibitions of caste that the forbears of the 100 million Muslims to-day embraced Islam.

Caste, in the Muslim view, is the antithesis of democracy. It is the Hindu caste system that keeps Hindus and Muslims apart. Inter-marriage is prohibited, social intercourse restricted; to the strict Hindu, the Muslim is impure. As Mahatma Gandhi says, the Hindu would rather die of thirst than take water from a Muslim.

A final solution of the Indian problem must take account of the social background. For this reason, many people of this country, who are interested in India, will welcome an authoritative work on caste in India, by Dr. J. H. Hutton.* His qualifications are unquestionable. An anthropologist of repute, he was a member of the Indian Civil Service, and, in that capacity, carried out the census of India in 1931, a work that involved a close study of the ethnography and of the social problems of the country. Dr. Hutton prefaces his treatment of the main subject by an examination of the ethnographical background.

There is, in his view, no parallel in the world to-day, nor ever has been, to the Hindu

* *Caste in India*. Cambridge University Press. 18s.

ste system. No satisfactory theory of its origins has ever been developed. Colour prejudice, clash of races, ideas, and superstitions associated with totemisms, and boos, hereditary occupations, the subtle religious philosophies of the Brahmins—these, Dr. Hutton's view, are some of the influences at work. Five centuries before Christ, Brahmin oppression brought about reactions which led to the movement sponsored by the Buddha, the result of which was the practical eclipse of Brahminism for several centuries. As Buddhist influences weakened, Brahminism reasserted its supremacy.

From time to time the Brahmin hierarchy has admitted new groups into the caste system. For example, the leaders of invading hordes from Central Asia, such as the Scythians, Huns, Kushans, in the first six or seven centuries of the Christian era, were absorbed as Kshattriyas, (mostly Rajputs), the rank and file taking their place as Sudras. A similar process has been at work among the aborigines the rulers being admitted as Rajputs with invented pedigrees, the lower grades of the people often left out as untouchables. In fact, such developments have not always been to the advantage of these backward folk. Karma and re-incarnation, holding out as they do hopes of a happier future life to the sufferer, have, in Dr. Hutton's opinion, helped to support the caste system. In point of fact, caste gives a religious basis to inequality. It must be admitted, however, that it has served to integrate the many conflicting elements in Indian life; but for it, Hinduism might have been submerged in the tide of Muslim invasions. The vitality of caste is shown by the anxiety displayed by the lower orders to rise in the social scale by adopting, for example, the practices of the higher castes, such as child-marriage, the prohibition of widow-remarriage, and so on. An interesting custom, now falling into disuse, devolved on Hindu rajahs responsibility for dealing with caste questions, such as excommunication, re-admission, and so on. Here one may note that the orthodox Hindu who proceeds overseas is expected to undergo purification on his return, one of the requirements being the consumption of the *Panchgavya*, the products of the sacred cow, milk, butter, curds, urine and dung.

Untouchability and all it involves is treated at length in the book. Do people in Britain realize that the outcast is deprived by caste Hindus of most of the privileges of social life, such as the use of wells, restaurants, and of temple entry? Distance pollution still persists; there is actually a group of unseeables, who only venture out after night-fall. Until quite recently, some of the lowest untouchable groups in the south of India, women and men, were not allowed to wear clothes above the waist.

Untouchability has degraded us, made us pariahs in South and East Africa and Canada. So long as Hindus wilfully regard untouchability as part of their religion, so long is Swaraj (Home Rule) unattainable. India is guilty. England has done nothing blacker. It must be extinguished. That is what Mahatma Gandhi told the caste Hindu not so very long ago. Yet he supports caste. Pundit Nehru, on the other hand, finds it difficult to understand how Mr. Gandhi accepts the present social order, based as it is, in the Pundit's own words on violence and conflict. "The spectacle of what is called religion," he tells us in his autobiography, "especially organized religion," (that is, the religion of the Brahmin hierarchy) "fills him with horror." "It stands for blind belief, reaction, dogma, bigotry and superstition, exploitation and preservation of vested interests." Brahmin though he is, he would like to make a clean sweep of the system.

With such convictions, one might have expected these two prominent leaders to promote the interests of the outcasts. On the contrary, Mahatma Gandhi, by his fast to death in 1931 induced the outcast leaders to give up the political advantages conferred on them by the British communal award, which made it possible for them to fight their own battles. The result has been to reduce them to political impotence.

After reading Dr. Hutton's book, one feels inclined to ask whether India, with a caste system still in vigorous life, is safe for democracy.

THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA, 1918-1934: A Study in the Failure of Democratic Government, by Mary Macdonald. *Royal Institute of International Affairs: Oxford University Press.* 8s. 6d.

Following the collapse of the Empire of the Habsburgs in the autumn of 1918 and the break away of the Czechs, the Poles, the Southern Slavs and the Hungarians to form independent States, the German provinces of the old *Reich* were left alone to face an uncertain future. The Christian Socialists of the provinces and the Social Democrats of Vienna and the industrial districts, although differing in almost every other respect, were united at that time in their desire to join the German *Reich*, and in their intention of instituting some form of democratic government. Frustrated by the Allies in their desire to join the German *Reich*, they proceeded to draw up a democratic constitution. In spite of the meticulous care with which this was done, it became apparent in 1927, if not earlier, that Austrian politics were moving steadily in an anti-democratic direction.

This study is an attempt to consider some of the more important of these causes, and more particularly a useful and illuminating examination of the highly technical federal Constitution of 1920, the text of which is conveniently printed in an appendix. Even if all the evils which ensued from the weak position in which the Government was deliberately placed could not have been foreseen, it was evident from the outset that the future well-being of Austria would depend upon the capacity of her rulers to pursue a firm policy of reconstruction over a period of years, unhampered by the exigencies of party politics. The danger to be feared from an unduly powerful Government could, as is rightly pointed out, have been obviated if it had been accepted that the Government was, as it is in this country, the executive committee of the Lower House. But the Austrian constitution provided

that, although members of the Government must be eligible for election to the Lower House, they need not actually be members of it.

Again, the introduction of proportional representation was undoubtedly ill-advised. Apart from other considerations it had the effect of weakening the National Council which quickly became a house divided against itself. Few, if any, with experience of Austrian politics during these troublesome years will dispute the judgment that "the battle was not only fierce, but also futile, for the closed list system, which had been introduced as the concomitant of proportional representation, meant that members to a large extent ceased to be free agents, and tended to act under the dictates of their respective party caucuses."

True as these conclusions unquestionably are, it is to be regretted that the limits of this study are artificially narrow. While the discussion of the influence of party politics and foreign policy in bringing the whole theory of democratic government into disrepute in Austria is both exhaustive and carefully documented, there are only passing references to economic conditions, social conflicts and the development of education. Yet these were factors which cannot be ignored in seeking the true explanation of the collapse of democratic government in Austria. They certainly played a more immediate part in bringing about the final collapse than did disagreements on such questions as the precise distribution of powers between federal and provincial authorities.

Even within the narrow limits which have been accepted for this study, it cannot be unreservedly commended. The attempt to achieve complete impartiality has resulted not only in making such judgments as are offered on men and measures of little value to the general reader, but also in the author adopting a style which makes this book far from easy reading.

J. MACKAY-MURE.

**THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC—
OVERTURE TO THE THIRD
REICH**, by Godfrey Scheele. *Faber
& Faber.* 18s.

Whether world-wide social and psychological factors inevitably drove the Weimar Republic towards the impasse out of which dictatorship only could show the way or, whether it was merely fourteen years of conspiracy in which actors and spectators with equal persistency merely prepared the Great Revenge, is a problem for historians. It is a problem which can be examined objectively only by the evaluation of all the factors, internal and external, which conditioned the development of the Weimar Republic. The author has made his choice and, therefore, the massive documentation can serve only as arguments in support of the main thesis of his book. The reader is left with the feeling that the carefully selected mass of data—even if it relies

too often on sources antagonistic to the Weimar Republic—would have deserved a correspondingly thorough analysis based on a broader view of the interplay of German and world factors, instead of the overwhelming emphasis on indigenous forces.

Once the fundamental thesis is accepted, the author's arguments follow with a consistency both methodical and convincing. The reader sees the unfolding picture of a State increasingly integrated and centralized to become the instrument for the Great Revenge. Though Stresemann realized that "the competitive resources of German industry would be stimulated at the expense of individual personality and independence" ultimately this served the underlying design aiming at revenge. No attempt is made to bring into context the general world-wide tendency towards centralization and the corresponding decline of individual liberty as a by-product of the

HILARY BOOK COMPANY LTD.
6, West Warwick Place, S.W.1

THE REBELLIOUS HEART

MONICA EWER 7/6d.

Should a nurse allow herself to become involved in the affairs of a patient? This delightful romance answers the question.

THE TALKATIVE PASSION

J. B. PRICE 7/6d.

A story simply and straightforwardly told in noble sentiment. The scene is in Africa.

WIFE IN COLD STORAGE

290 p.p. J. B. PRICE 10/6d.

A remarkable story by a distinguished writer. There is tension throughout and clever characterisation.

NON-FICTION

OLD CASTLES IN SCOTLAND

HENRY TERRELL, F.S.A. 12/6d.

The history of Scotland's castles in verse, legend and picture.

anachronistic rivalry of mutually hostile sovereign States in a world increasingly interdependent. Efficiency, an index of national sovereignty's race against the logic of interdependence, is relegated to the rôle of a German instrument. Thus, to offset the influence of political justice which was, presumably, "the dominant theme in Europe", Germany "turned to the new doctrine of economic reason with its test of practicability" to attract western financial and business circles. How far this political justice was effective in inter-war Europe and to what extent was the substitution of "economic reason" a purely German device, we are not told. It is only natural that in this calculating and single-minded conspiracy "while Germany built up her strength she needed Locarno." Once again, the picture would gain in objectivity by an analytical examination to what extent the other signatories at Locarno deemed it necessary to build up German strength for their own purposes. On National Socialism we are told that it "was made possible through the control of mechanical civilization, with all its penetrating propaganda powers, by an egoistic philosophy of force woven around the Nation." If this is a complete definition, there is a grave danger indeed that all its component factors are maturing in various corners of the globe to produce the same results.

Quotations, taken out of their context, are inevitably unfair to the author. They should serve only to indicate a great gap in Mr. Scheele's book.

The symptoms which characterized the fourteen years of the Weimar Republic were largely the products of a world-wide social and technological transformation which calls for urgent readjustments in our ideas about the rôle of liberal freedoms in an age of remote control and mass persuasion. It is likely that Naziism was at least as much a specific German response to a world-wide search for new forms of social expression, as a mere power-political con-

spiracy. To disregard this, means the throwing away of the lessons of the crowded and momentous history of the last decades. Moreover, it threatens that the justified part of that demand for new forms will find new and violent expressions to the surprise of those who have not risked an unconventional approach in the analysis of an unconventional problem.

TIBOR MENDE.

THE LIFE OF NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN, by Keith Feiling. Macmillan. 25s.

The writing of contemporary biography is beset with pitfalls. The biographer must not only contend with prejudices of his own but must attempt to master those of his readers and reviewers. To give an example. This reviewer, on reading Professor Feiling's book *The Life of Neville Chamberlain*, was angered by the words used about George Lansbury on page 139. He thought them unnecessarily disparaging and unfair. He felt them to be born of prejudice, thus displaying no doubt a prejudice of his own.

However, judged as dispassionately as possible, Professor Feiling has written a biography which does great credit to his diligence in research and more than a little to his perspicacity. It is an able book. Yet, there is a feeling throughout, that Professor Feiling was too lightly armed in experience to write a really important book and too serious in intent to write a purely entertaining one. He is too lightly armed, despite his deep sense of history, because the time is not yet for the historical approach to Chamberlain's life. What was needed was the political biography and while Professor Feiling was an obvious choice for this task as regards sympathy for the views of his subject he was not personally acquainted with Chamberlain nor intimately with the world of politics.

Professor Feiling's style is workmanlike but no more than that. He does not really admire his subject. Moreover

thoroughly to understand Chamberlain it is necessary to have moved as much in local government circles, where Chamberlain really felt at home, as in the political walks around Westminster. Chamberlain was a good administrator but he brought local government talents to Westminster and they were incapable of working there with the same charm. Professor Feiling quotes with disapproval Lloyd George's summary of Chamberlain's character: "a man of rigid competency", "lost in an emergency or in creative tasks at any time", "vein of self-sufficient obstinacy" but it is by no means untrue, if one-sided. Patently Austen should have known better than to advocate the translation of Neville from the Lord Mayoralty of Birmingham to the Ministry of National Service without an apprenticeship served in the House.

Even so Neville Chamberlain was undoubtedly unlucky. He came to politics late, too late for a man of his cast of mind, and he was faced with a situation in which "bewilderment" seems best to describe all political leaders of the time. On Professor Feiling's showing he was at least more capable of a policy than his colleagues and it was certainly not his fault, after he became prime minister, that he was obliged to bat on so sticky a wicket with so poor a team. In sum, he is a man for whom one can feel a good deal of sympathy. He was not big enough for the occasion but the occasion was unprecedented. If he were blind, so were many others. If he were revolted by the thought of war:

To me the very idea that the hard-won savings of our people, which ought to be devoted to the alleviation of suffering, to the opening out of fresh institutions and recreations, to the care of the old, to the development of the minds and bodies of the young—the thought that these savings should have to be dissipated upon the construction of weapons of war is hateful and damnable

so were many others. At another time, it has been said, Neville Chamberlain might have served his country better.

THE STARS AND THE MIND

by M. Davidson

D.Sc., F.R.A.S.

It is virtually the first work to appear in recent times which embodies all the latest developments in astronomy and attempts to link those developments to the more general field of philosophic thought.

Illustrated. 10s. 6d. net.

MYTH AND RITUAL IN DANCE, GAME, AND RHYME

by Lewis Spence

The author attempts to unveil the background from which have sprung such traditional forms of culture as folk-dances, nursery rhymes, and children's games.

Illustrated. 12s. 6d. net

POPULATION, PSYCHOLOGY, AND PEACE

by J. C. Flugel

M.A., D.Sc.,

With an Introduction by

C. E. M. JOAD.

In this volume Professor Flugel deals with the social, ethical, and political aspects of a fundamental problem—the population problem—which must be faced if human life throughout the world is to become more prosperous and more peaceful.

Thinker's Library. 2s. 6d. net.

THE NEW WORLD

by Lord Snell

A guide to individual and international behaviour.

Paper cover, 2s. net.

C. A. WATTS & CO. LTD.

5 & 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet St., E.C.4.

Alas for those whose fate it is to be judged by what was and not what might have been.

JOHN ARMITAGE.

KING JESUS, by Robert Graves.

Cassell. 12s. 6d.

THE CHALLENGE OF NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS, by L. H.

Marshall. *Macmillan. 15s.*

When Pilate wrote: "This is Jesus, King of the Jews" over the cross of the Founder of Christianity, he was, according to Mr. Graves, but stating the sober truth, for Jesus was in fact the son of Antipater, the murdered heir of Herod to whom Mary, who was of the royal Davidic line, had been secretly married. Such is Mr. Graves's solution of the mystery of the birth of Christ, and it inevitably involves the machinery of the "thriller", plots and counter-plots, secret stairs, disguises, hair-breadth escapes and so on.

He puts the story into the mouth of Agabus the Decapolitan who had it from one of the leaders of the strictly Jewish Christians towards the end of the first century, and the most noteworthy thing in the book is the consistency with which Mr. Graves maintains the artistic fiction. The volume is, as a matter of fact, far more interesting for its picture of a first century mind, with its mingled shrewd judgment and esoteric and magical beliefs, than for any other reason. Agabus is here, and here to the life, and the account of his mind is fascinating and absorbing; but, Jesus of Nazareth...? The answer to that question is, it is to be feared, that at that point Mr. Graves has registered little but a tragic failure. He has drawn with real power the world into which Jesus was born and the milieu in which He lived, but Jesus Himself remains obstinately a first century figure, and One Who, moreover could never have escaped from the first century to evoke a worship which has crossed all frontiers and all centuries. There is imagination here, and wide and careful learning, but the figure that emerges is such as a Cherokee medicine-man would

have drawn, say, of Einstein.

Mr. Graves has handicapped himself by the very medium he has adopted, for historical interpretation needs not only historical sympathy and imagination adequate enough to enable one to re-create a historical personage in terms of his own time, but that re-creation in turn has to be re-translated into our own contemporary idiom. It is this re-translation that Mr. Graves has failed to perform but the failure to do it is fatal, and the book never moves out of the realm of unlikely conjecture and apocrypha.

Mr. Marshall has had a double object in view in writing this survey of New Testament ethics. On the one hand, he desired to expound the Christian ethic as it is found in the New Testament, and this he has done in a thorough and unusually readable manner. Starting out from the position that New Testament ethics are not to be divorced from religious faith, and that the central idea is that of the Kingdom of God, he gives us an ordered exposition of his theme, with commendable lucidity and logical articulation. The mind of Jesus Himself is first examined with regard to the essential nature of ethical good and evil and this leads on to two fruitful chapters of exposition of the moral imperatives and of the Christian attitude to society. His final chapter in this section of the book is a defence of the ethics of Jesus with the eschatologists and humanists chiefly in mind. Next, he turns to the thought of Paul and, broadly speaking, follows the same procedure. This aspect of the book is very well done indeed, and Mr. Marshall is to be congratulated on having given us an organic and articulated presentation of his subject which is a delight to read.

It is however when we come to Mr. Marshall's second object in writing that one is sensible of grave limitations and that one has doubts as to how far he has really succeeded in relating "the ethical message of the New Testament to the dominant problems of the present

day." Mr. Marshall seems not to have wrestled with the two problems that have to be wrestled with if that object has to be achieved. He has neither related ethical teaching of the New Testament to that group action which is an ineradicable factor in the life of to-day, nor has he related it to the conception of Natural Law, and it has to be confessed that the result is an appearance of taking his fences and solving his ethical difficulties somewhat too easily.

What Mr. Marshall has done, therefore, has been to give us the best and most competent exposition of original New Testament ethics we have had for many a long day, no more, but it is all to the good that he has given us in such clear-cut outline the ethics which have to be transposed into the key of modern life.

B. C. PLOWRIGHT.

LORD'S 1787-1945, by Sir Pelham Warner, *George G. Harrap*. 15s.

It is nearly a century since the Rev. James Pycroft described the ideal cricket historian as "one who should combine, with all the resources of a ready writer, traditional lore and practical experience."

No words could better describe Sir Pelham Warner's qualifications for writing the history of Lord's Cricket Ground. He is already renowned as a writer from his numerous other books on cricket. He has been steeped in the traditional lore of the game, from the time when as a boy in the West Indies he studied it in the pages of *The Field*, *Wisden* and *The Times* and in May 1887 realized his childhood's ambition of passing through the turnstile of Lord's, up to the present when he has been accorded the highest honours of election as a Trustee of the M.C.C. and the hanging of his portrait in the Long Room at Lord's. His practical experience as a great batsman, a great captain, a selector of unsurpassed experience and a member for very many years of various M.C.C. committees is too widely known

to require comment.

The book begins with an account of the foundation and early days of Lord's. It is curious that Yorkshire, which has produced so many great cricketers, should also have been the birth-place of Thomas Lord, from whom the most famous of all grounds takes its name. The original 'Lord's', however, was in Dorset Square, whence it moved first to another position on the St. John's Wood Estate and finally to the present site. In each case Lord had arranged that the original Dorset Square turf should be transferred, so that "the noblemen and Gentlemen of the M.C.C." should be able "to play on the same footing as before." The site was only held on lease, however, and in 1860 occurred the greatest threat to the ground until the recent days of flying bombs, when the freehold was sold by auction to a Mr. Isaac Moses for £7,000. Eventually the M.C.C. bought it in 1866 for

HEFFER'S OF CAMBRIDGE

carry a large stock
of **BOOKS**
on all subjects

**New & Secondhand
English & Foreign**

Just issued :

Catalogue 613 containing 500
Book Bargains

Have you any books to sell?
Good prices are given for Fine,
Rare and Scholarly Books

**W. HEFFER &
SONS LIMITED**

Petty Cury

Cambridge



£18,000!

From the fascinating story of the early days the author writes of some early personalities: Lord Frederick Beauclerk, the 'W.G.' of his day; Felix, whose real name was Wanostrocht; Mynn, for whom the whole county of Kent mourned; Jenner-Fust, who kept wicket without gloves or pads; Lillywhite called 'The Nonpareil'; Aislabie, immortalized in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*; Haygarth, who batted 3 hours for 16 and 4 hours for 26; Fellows, who was buried in his I.Z. cap; Chandos Leigh, who often wore a grey bowler hat with an I.Z. ribbon.

Of course the great 'W.G.' figures prominently as the tale unfolds; at one time scoring 134 out of 201 and taking 10 wickets for 81 runs, while still under twenty; at another protesting at a ball passing through his beard, and being finally honoured by the erection of a gate at Lord's to his memory, dedicated simply to the 'The Great Cricketer'. Hobbs, "from about 1910 to 1927 . . . the finest batsman in the world," Bradman, whose performances are "unique in the annals of cricket" and Hammond, whose "colossal achievements command the respect of every sort of cricketer", all have their place in the chronicle with many more amusing and interesting facts and anecdotes of cricket at Lord's.

At the end of the book are twelve appendices, devoted to statistics and certain special aspects of the history of Lord's outside the scope of the book itself. In one of these high tribute is paid to the Lord's staff and another is devoted to school cricket at Lord's. An appendix on tennis and rackets gives details of the M.C.C. Gold and Silver Racket Prizes, but somewhat surprisingly gives the reader to understand that the rackets court is still in existence. Viscount Ullswater has written an interesting appendix on that most fascinating collection of cricket memories, the Long Room pictures, many of which are included as illustrations in the book.

As the latest addition to the biblio-

graphy of cricket Sir Pelham's book will be welcomed not only by all those to whom it is dedicated—cricketers the world over—but by all cricket-lovers.

ABERDARE.

THE PAGEANT OF THE YEARS, by Sir Philip Gibbs. Heinemann. 18s.

In his lifetime as journalist, novelist and lecturer, Sir Philip Gibbs has reported the front-page events of this century. He has talked to the front-page men of our time—Briand, Stresemann, Hoover, Lloyd George, Ramsay MacDonald, Winston Churchill, Henry Wallace. And at the end of this story, ranging from the last quarter of "Queen Victoria's golden days (for those who had the gold)" to the summer of 1946, covering war and peace in many countries of the world, Sir Philip sums up:

If I have learned anything it is that pity is more intelligent than hatred, that mercy is better even than justice, that if one walks around the world with friendly eyes one makes good friends.

Is this an exasperating conclusion to *The Pageant of the Years*? It is a revealing one. It reveals a secret of successful journalism in this age. The sociologist, the economist, the scientific thinker in Sir Philip's place would have made an analysis seemingly less platitudinous in its conclusions. But their books would have had little popular appeal because, unlike Sir Philip's work, theirs would have less identity with the minds of to-day's millions of readers.

Sir Philip's reportage is the kind most people like. It is not profound, nor dull; it is readable. In bringing the little things of everyday life into prominence, Alfred Harmsworth was the architect of the new journalism but Sir Philip Gibbs has been one of its builders.

This is not disparagement: a craftsman—whatever his craft—merits respect. *The Pageant of the Years* reflects all the brilliance of the new journalism; it is full of names, gossip and incident, written simply and clearly, in shortish sentences, well paragraphed.

But besides this talent, despite his apparently inherent shyness, Sir Philip shows he has needed nerve and character in his life-work to maintain its integrity.

When, in Copenhagen, the veteran journalists of Europe were accepting Dr. Cook's discovery of the North Pole, the young reporter of the *Daily Chronicle*—dissatisfied with Dr. Cook's evidence—was cabling daily messages which denied the claim. He stuck to his story even while the returned hero was being fêted at State banquets and receiving honours from learned societies. Popular feeling in Denmark was so much against Sir Philip at that time that he was booed in restaurants—and even challenged to a duel by a respected Dane.

Again, at a time when no journalist had been allowed inside the Vatican, Sir Philip Gibbs arrived in Rome under instructions from his news editor to "interview the Pope." He got the interview.

There are many such instances. For the critical reader, these might be nullified by the superficial or melodramatic—"I had an astonishing conversation with Himmler. . . 'I shall probably have to shake hands with him,' I told Agnes. 'Do you happen to have any carbohic soap?'").

Even so, Sir Philip is not false to himself or his calling. This is a good autobiography by one of the best exponents of popular journalism.

JAMES BARTLETT.

THE LAMP, by Richard Church.
CRAZY GAUNT, by G. Rostrevor Hamilton. *Heinemann.* 6s.

It is customary for the critic, in examining a long poem, to refer to its "form." Of all the terms borrowed from other arts, and applied to poetry, "form," as applied to a long poem, is the most vague and impracticable. The critic may speak of the form of a sonnet or lyric, because his brain can retain so brief a shape. The reader of the long poem, however, must be constantly reacting, momentarily, to momentary

moods. At the end of his reading he may recall these isolated responses but he cannot see the poem whole, since the human brain cannot retain it: for this reason he can have no conception of its shape, or "form". The critic may say whether there was hindrance to the flow of thought and whether style obtruded upon, or clashed with, mood; but he can say no more. Those are his limits, and, within them, the term "form," as it is understood in relation to the visual arts, may not be legitimately applied.

In *The Lamp*, a poem of over two thousand lines, Mr. Church moulds method smoothly to the mood set in his prologue:—

Let me be simple; let my music
Capture a child's imagination.
A difficult thought is not a thing
A blackbird or a god will sing.

The poem runs without hitch or jar.
His story is of a French family under

COWIE

DONALD COWIE, the new name in poetry, is at present on so many lips that it is unnecessary to do more than announce that a 2nd. ed. of his *Collected Poetical Works*, Vol. I., 256pp., 10s. 6d., is already approaching over-subscription a few weeks after the issue of the first. Only a few remain of a separate limited edition of 100 copies, signed and numbered by the poet at one guinea.

OPINIONS of this rising giant: "Will probably represent this age in the future." (*The Clique*). "The eagerness of this poetry." (*Edmund Blunden*). "Might have been written by Shelley." (*Wm. Saunders*). "There seem to be no heights to which he may not rise." (*Gordon Latta*).

ALSO new imps. of *A Writer's Notebook*, Anon, 9s. 6d., "Excellent" (*Agate*); *Chase Me A Kiwi, A Portrait of New Zealand*, Aldwyn Abberley, 10s. 6d.; and *The Pioneers*, Julian Mountain, 9s., the classic New Zealand novel, "Superb", (*Frank O'Connor*), from

THE TANTIVY PRESS, MALVERN

the German occupation: they are simple people and the poet tells of them with a simplicity which is both sincere and cleverly contrived. To this end of simplicity of manner, he uses considerable artifice, as well he may, for artless poetry must be clumsy. His French professor, the head of the family, is clearly and memorably drawn—

He liked to take his after-luncheon slumber
Beneath the mulberry tree beside the well;
Coffee, cognac, and books set on a tray,
Round which the frogs foregathered without number

To croak, from Aristophanes, a spell
That always worked, because he knew the play.

If this is a first-impact point, it also has something of the quality of a painting by one of the Primitives and its apparent naïveté comes of care which the poet is at pains to conceal.

Mr. Church does not write of war from the narrow angle of nationalism, or even of ideology, but of war which happens to human beings. There is both good and evil in his French family, good and evil in the German soldiery. He is concerned with human love and the tragedy which is engendered by the weakness of those who love and who need love. His story moves, with tenderness about its tragedy, to a conclusion of a greater dignity than we have come to expect of plots of war and occupation. Mr. Church convinces: he is holding out a grain of the truth which is precious and not to be ignored.

Mr. Hamilton's problems, in his four dramatic sketches under the title of *Crazy Gaunt*, were more purely technical. He has taken the burden of communication entirely upon the human voice (*Senior & Co.*, one of these sketches, has already been broadcast). The demand of voice-drama is onward movement, which must have its minor crises while still moving towards the major crisis. The listener's mind must always move, onward and upward:

It storms through
The veins and muscles. It melts away
The separate life. It makes a crowd
One great animal soul.

With such technical care, such

thoughtful use of words with cumulative effect, Mr. Hamilton has solved his problems. In the first two sketches, *Senior & Co.* and *Man in the Basement* the aim is purely dramatic, but, in *Crazy Gaunt* and *Thirty-Eight Sickbed* his purpose is to leave behind the idea which breeds and feeds thought: in each purpose he succeeds.

JOHN ARLOTT.

PEGUY AND LES CAHIERS DE LA QUINZAINÉ, by Daniel Halévy. Translated by Ruth Bethell. *Dennis Dobson*. 12s. 6d.

MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE, 1870-1940, by Professor Denis Saurat. *Dent*. 12s. 6d.

Charles Péguy was killed in action on September 5, 1914, at the age of forty-one. At that time even those who knew him best could hardly have foreseen how great his influence was to become. In 1940, and subsequently, it was to Péguy that his compatriots turned for a pattern of integrity, and a spiritual vision, that might sustain them in days when accepted values seemed to be crumbling. It was in his writings that the men of the resistance found the embodiment of their aspirations for that new and better France in which Péguy had so fervently believed.

Daniel Halévy's book was first published in 1918, and was considerably revised before the appearance of the last edition in 1941. He was a friend and colleague of Péguy, and he writes with much sympathy and insight; he helps us to understand the qualities which gave Péguy his remarkable ascendancy: his single-mindedness, his inability to compromise, his childlike and lovable nature, his fine humanity. An intense patriot, and yet one devoid of selfish nationalism; a socialist who stood apart and refused to accept the limitations of party discipline; a Catholic whose beliefs transcended those of orthodoxy—Péguy was all this, and by terms a poet, printer, publisher, pamphleteer, philosopher and soldier

of France.

Péguy's independence of spirit led him to establish the *Cahiers de la Quinzaine* which were published from 1900 to 1914. They provided the opportunity for him to engage in his passionate onslaught against every form of materialism, corruption and injustice. He found his greatest fulfilment, however, not in controversy, but in his lifelong devotion to Joan of Arc. It is in the "mysteries" that he wrote in her honour, and in those celebrating the divine virtue of hope, that some of his most characteristic utterances are to be found.

Péguy's prose style is not an easy one; it is marked by constant repetitions which in any author of less sincerity, might appear only a tedious device. His poetry too—and in his later years it was with poetry that Péguy was increasingly concerned—is often diffuse and obscure. His writing has the naïve quality of legends or folklore, although it is free from any archaic affectation, and it is in fact completely personal in its rhythms and cadence. It contains many lines of singular beauty, especially those which speak of death and sacrifice. Péguy appears to have had a foreknowledge of his own approaching death, and with it he acquired a sense of peace and exaltation:

*Heureuse ceux qui sont morts dans les grandes batailles,
Couchés dessus le sol à la face de Dieu,*
as he wrote in December, 1913.

This book is the first full-length study of Péguy to appear in English, and the publishers are to be congratulated on their undertaking. The translation maintains a very fair general level, although in a number of places more satisfactory renderings could be found; for instance "*avilissement*" is translated by "vilification," a sense not familiar in current English, since degradation or debasement is what is meant. There is some tendency to use colloquial expressions inappropriately, and to employ adjectives which do not convey the meaning of the original: for instance

"raw, frowning pages" for "*pages coléreuses et sanglantes*."

Professor Saurat has written a very lively account of the trends and personalities in modern French literature, full of quips and paradoxical statements, unexpected analogies and vigorous judgments. He fires them off in a rapid fusillade, and the reader has hardly recovered his breath before yet another reputation is brought low—among them Sainte-Beuve, Brunetière, Maupassant, Huysmans, Paul Bourget and Claudel. Of the short story, Professor Saurat says that it is doubtful whether it is "a literary game at all. It may be that it was merely meant by nature and providence to fill two columns in a newspaper in times when paper is cheap and real news insufficient." He has no sympathy for what he calls the industrialization of literature, or for any writing that loses its true literary quality by being made to serve as the instrument of politics or religion. His regard is primarily for what may be called "pure" literature—hence his appreciation of Mallarmé and Valéry. In the novel, Professor Saurat's preferences go to Zola, Loti, Anatole France, Rolland, Gide, Duhamel, Jules Romains, and above all to Proust. About all these authors he has some illuminating and suggestive criticism. The account of the younger novelists might well be longer, and Montherlant occupies a rather unduly large proportion of it. There is no mention of Colette. Professor Saurat concludes with a general assessment of the whole period, and stresses intellectual courage and love of truth as two of its outstanding characteristics.

CHARLES GOULD.

WANTED.

Stories and Articles for
Popular Journals—

DONALD CRAIG, HOLYCROSS, THURLES

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

THAT antimony, bauxite, cadmium, chrome, platinum, pyrites and uranium should be included in A DICTIONARY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (*Methuen*. 8s. 6d.) is a woeful sign of the times. Space, however, is given to rice, wheat and olive oil, which at first sight seems to restore the balance. While coffee too has its statistics, presumably because it can be burnt in eras of over-production, there is no heading for tea; can it be that this will not reach international status until India becomes self-governing? This useful little encyclopaedia of events and trends which A. M. Hyamson has compiled should not be far from the elbow of anyone who needs world facts in a hurry.

Polish problems

A student of Polish affairs, who has frequently written on the subject in THE FORTNIGHTLY, Mr. Foster Anderson has published his diary for three months in 1946, WHAT I SAW IN POLAND (*Windsor Press*. 8s. 6d. Paper cover). To present some facets of life in that long-tortured country he uses all of his own philosophic approach. Yet, as he says, "statistics, however reliable, are not enlightening without some knowledge of the emotional background of the people to whom they refer." The day-to-day experiences of a man so individual in character and outlook could not fail to make an absorbing record, and this in spite of distracting misprints. Probably his new book which is promised shortly, dealing with the "eastern frontier of Europe", will have the added benefit of more careful proof-reading.—In POLAND AND THE BALTIC (*Polish Institute for Overseas Problems*. 21s.) Colonel Baginski, coming further west, claims that the Oder Basin should be part of Poland and of "the independent federation of Central Europe." As Alan Graham, M.P., says in his Introduction, this book (which is an enlarged edition

of one published in 1942) shows that "free access to a free Baltic is the *sine qua non* of a free and independent Poland." The comprehensive maps and the bibliography at the end of each part are valuable. But it must be stated bluntly that the price of this and the former book seems to be high.

Welcome reprints

Dent in commencing a new edition of Joseph Conrad's work reminds one that Poland has glories no less than her pains. YOUTH, HEART OF DARKNESS, THE END OF THE TETHER, LORD JIM, THE MIRROR OF THE SEA and A PERSONAL RECORD are already available in three volumes (6s. each volume) and this generation should use the opportunity to become acquainted with Conrad. Someone has said that his style is self-conscious, which is taken to be complimentary; for though English was to Conrad a foreign language, it could be wished that more British writers to-day tried to express their thoughts in the mother tongue with his clarity, precision and power.—This seems the place to call attention to another republished "classic"—Jane Austen's PERSUASION (*Williams & Norgate*. 8s. 6d.), introduced by Angela Thirkell, who reviews the book acutely and puts it into perspective with the other Jane novels. If not one of the best, yet in it for the first time is seen a refusal to contemplate permanent happiness, so that "Miss Austen, with her last words, speaks in a new voice." The binding, with the lettering on the front cover, is so complementary to the book that it is a delight to handle it.

Days that are no more

Jane would have been at ease describing LORD GOSCHEN AND HIS FRIENDS, for theirs was that safe, Victorian world where, as Sir Shane Leslie says in his introduction to these letters, edited by Percy Colson (*Hutchinson*. 21s.), "con-

suls of course give the temperature of the British Empire." This makes a lively scrapbook of the nineteenth century with its facsimile handwritings and its photographs of the eminent in literature, politics or society, interspersed with a host of stories recalled as asides by the editor. Being a Chancellor of the Exchequer to the good Queen had its compensations apparently.—In a different but equally comfortable Victorian circle lived M. V. Hughes whose autobiographical studies, published between 1934 and 1937, have now become a trilogy which she calls *A LONDON FAMILY* (*Oxford University Press*. 15s.). Her account makes one sigh for a world one never knew, where people were not averse to depending on their own resources for pleasure, and where it was taken for granted that life was for giving as well as for snatching. This forever vanished age is recreated with the charm of simplicity and must arouse in the thoughtful a nostalgia, an envy or an uneasy wondering—according to age.

Damage and reparation

Still in the nineteenth century, we turn to CHARLES CANNING WINMILL by his daughter (*Dent*. 15s.). He was thirty-six when Victoria died and had already begun to impress his contemporaries as an architect opposed to the popular drastic repair of ancient buildings. A pioneer in the type of restoration which is now practised as a commonplace, his influence is particularly seen in church work. His daughter seems to have inherited his lovable commonsense, and keeps her pride in him within bounds. The quiet story she tells is embellished with his own sketches, extracts from his letters and numerous photographs.—In 1923 Winmill let his imagination turn to a new London:

... think of a St. Paul's, white with a gold dome, and colour to make the whole place sing ...

and lived to know it twice struck by bombs. ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL IN WAR TIME by the Very Reverend W. R.

Matthews (*Hutchinson*. 10s. 6d.) gives a complete history from 1939, with some fine illustrations, of air raid precautions there. Other people's firewatching of course was always more exciting, and duty even in *Adelphi* certainly yielded no such adventures as befell the St. Paul's Watch. But what a place to catch the imagination—passages, crypt, great spaces, dome—and to echo the footsteps in the dead of night, apart from any sounds above! A chapter on damage and reparation, contributed by W. Godfrey Allen, F.R.I.B.A., Surveyor to the Fabric, goes back to the first sign of defects nearly 250 years ago and forward to the time when temporary repairs will have given place to "major reconstruction". That time will be hastened by the sale of this book, whose royalties go to the Cathedral Restoration Fund.

Two kinds of short poems

It is good to see *THE SHORTER POEMS OF WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR*, selected and edited by J. B. Sidgwick (*Cambridge University Press*. 6s.). Particularly helpful is the biographical sketch, assessing the anomalous place occupied by Landor in English literature, which constitutes the editor's introduction. Though his nearly ninety years were contemporaneous with the Romantic revival he was entirely uninfluenced by lake poet and pre-Raphaelite and remained steeped in classicism. It is said of this life-long rebel and egoist that the scholar and the philosopher showed "too starkly in his writings. He made no concessions to fools" and the common reader therefore neglects him. To be praised for his perfect prose, the disciplines of which illumine the verse he wrote for relaxation, and not to be read, seems to be, as Mr. Sidgwick says, "undeservedly shabby treatment."—Another collection of short poems is to be found in *THE MOUNTAIN* by Geoffrey Johnson (*Williams & Norgate*. 8s. 6d.). These for the most part are untouched by post-war topicalities; only here and there is a compromise, as:

And for our exile, till our minds are sweet,
Build us a town amid the wheat.

Concerned with the elementals ("The earth lover", "The mares", "Where the village ends", "Jubilate" for examples), Mr. Johnson's absorption in country things is pushing ahead his business of being a poet. He sometimes works too hard to polish the pedestrian thought but the indispensable industry is his in such abundance that his full development cannot long be delayed.

Relentless clockwork

In *BEACH RED* (*Michael Joseph*. 7s. 6d.) Peter Bowman makes the experiment of cutting up his story, of the landing on a Japanese-held island told by an American soldier, into ten word lengths. His preface explains his reasons for this behaviour thus:

Since the passing of time forms a background for events, each line of prose, ten words long, indicates a second, and by a logical extension of the pattern, each 60-line chapter represents a minute. The time scheme . . . serves merely to introduce the subtle tyranny of the military timetable and to highlight the relentless clockwork which sets a battle in motion.

And it should be said immediately that the method works—the reader is caught up by the gathering excitement, shares the thoughts that assail the man who goes into action, leaps to the grim humour of: "Battle doesn't determine who is right. Only who is left", and sees through his eyes with a photographic sharpness that: "People don't know how to live. They only have suspicions." The author endears by his honesty—"each line of prose" kills any prejudice that what follows will be indigestible slabs of blank verse. It would be a pity if the growing boredom with war experiences should cause this book to seem anachronistic. In vulgar par-

lance it truly deserves to "catch on".

The river of life

As a commentary on the statistics of child delinquency, and the recent cases of cruelty to children, Winston Clewes's *SWEET RIVER IN THE MORNING* (*Michael Joseph*. 9s. 6d.) appears at the appropriate time. Young Charlie Balcum is bound over for theft and at the age of seventeen takes to burglary. Without for a sentence sacrificing the first requirement of a novel that it shall tell a story the author shows more convincingly than any official document could do how the "sweet river" of John Donne's imagining grows muddled. The tale is told in reverse, from the moment when after breaking the window with his elbow the boy mutters: "Well—stone the crows. Bloody thing's open all the time." This backwards device serves to throw up the scattered forces which have combined to bring Charlie to crime, and leaves any psychologist's meagre findings a long way behind. The details seem to be observed perfectly; the uncouth speech and lack of vocabulary are exactly reproduced. The "grown-ups" too—Mr. Gladstone, who owned the factory, and his mother, Balcum senior, Charlie's stepmother, Mrs. Jessel and her Alice who, though only Charlie's age, expounds the worldliness in keeping with her upbringing—each is clearly identifiable. There are no stock characters or props for prejudice in this novel and so cumulative is the mingled horror, pity and disgust of the reader that the ending, arrived at without knowing what is to become of young Charlie, is unbearable. Perhaps Mr. Clewes intends to tell us later. The strength of his book of course is that he betrays no horror, pity and disgust.

GRACE BANYARD.

ADVERTISEMENT AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4, 5 & 6, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.1

PUBLISHED FOR THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, LTD., BY HORACE MARSHALL & SON, LTD.,
Publishing Department, Temple House, Tallis Street, E.C.4

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY GEORINGS OF ASHFORD, LTD., 80 HIGH STREET, ASHFORD, KENT
PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND